



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Volume III.
Number 10.

December, 1895.

Whole
Number 30.

THE SCHOOL REVIEW

A JOURNAL OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

THE NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND PREPARATORY SCHOOLS

The Tenth Annual Meeting of the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools was held in the Lyman Gymnasium, Brown University, Providence, R. I., on Friday and Saturday, Oct. 11th and 12th. 1895.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON

The Association was called to order by President L. Clark Seelye, of Smith College, who occupied the chair throughout the meetings.

Professor Benjamin F. Clarke, of Brown University, in felicitous words, welcomed the members and their guests to the university, and explained the hospitable provisions made for their entertainment.

On motion of Mr. D. S. Sanford, of Brookline, the President was authorized to appoint a Committee on Nominations. This committee, as subsequently announced, consisted of Professor William Carey Poland, Dr. John Tetlow, Professor John H. Wright, Mr. Daniel S. Sanford, and Mr. Charles E. Fish.

The Association at once proceeded to the discussion announced on the programme.

ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS IN HISTORY

The discussion was based on the following

RESOLUTIONS

I. *Resolved*, That the colleges be requested to include in their requirements for admission a choice of subjects out of the following topics :*

*The Conference expects that for any one of the seven topics one year's work of at least three periods a week, or an equivalent, would be necessary.

- (1) The History of Greece, with especial reference to Greek life, literature, and art.
- (2) The History of Rome: the Republic and Empire, and Teutonic outgrowths, to 800 A. D.
- (3) German History: To be so taught as to elucidate the general movement of mediæval and modern history.
- (4) French History: To be so taught as to elucidate the general movement of mediæval and modern history.
- (5) English History, with especial reference to social and political development.
- (6) American History, with the elements of Civil Government.*
- (7) A detailed study of a limited period, pursued in an intensive manner.

—any two of these topics to constitute a required subject for entrance to college. The colleges are earnestly requested to accept any additional topic or topics from the list as additional preparation for entrance or for advanced standing.

II. *Resolved*, That satisfactory written work done in the secondary school, and certified by the teacher, should constitute a considerable part of the evidence of proficiency required by the college.

III. *Resolved*, That such written work should include some practice in each of the following:

- (a) Notes and digests of the pupil's reading, outside the text-books.
- (b) Written recitations requiring the use of judgment and the application of elementary principles.
- (c) Written parallels between historical characters or periods.
- (d) Brief investigations of topics limited in scope, prepared outside the class-room, and including some use of original material.
- (e) Historical maps or charts, made from printed data and comparison of existing maps, and showing movements of exploration, migration, or conquest, territorial changes, or social phenomena.

IV. *Resolved*, That the examinations in history for entrance to college ought to be so framed as to require comparison and the use of judgment on the pupil's part, rather than the mere use of memory. The examinations should presuppose the use of good text-books collateral reading, and practice in written work. Geographical knowledge should be tested by requiring the location of places and movements on an outline map.

PRESIDENT SEELYE: The subject for discussion is "The Propositions of the Conference on Entrance Requirements in History." Shortly after the December meeting of this Association, a letter was received by the Executive Committee from Professor Start, of Tufts College,

* It is expected that the study of American History will be such as to show the development and origin of the institutions of our own country: that it will, therefore, include the colonial beginnings; and that it will deal with the period of discovery and early settlement sufficiently to show the relations of peoples on the American continent, and the meaning of the struggle for mastery.

suggesting that a Conference be appointed to consider the requirements for admission to our schools and colleges in history, and that the report of this Conference form the subject of discussion at our next annual meeting. That letter was favorably received by the Executive Committee, and Dr. Ray Greene Huling, Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, Professor Edwin A. Start, Professor Katherine Coman, and Mr. Byron Groce were appointed as such Conference. Mr. Byron Groce subsequently resigned his place on the Conference, and Miss Anna Boynton Thompson was appointed to fill the vacancy. The Conference, after giving careful consideration to the subject in several sessions, and soliciting suggestions and assistance from teachers of history in our colleges and preparatory schools, made last April a report giving their matured conclusions. The report seemed to the Committee of so much value that it was ordered to be printed and to be sent to all the members of this Association. I presume all of you received a copy of the report. Whatever be our opinion concerning the recommendations of this Conference, I think we shall all gratefully appreciate the ability and faithfulness with which they have discharged their arduous duties. Two of these gentlemen also served upon the Conference on History which met at Madison in 1892, whose report has been embodied in the report of the Committee of Ten ; all of the members of this Conference are specialists in their departments, and are known, therefore, as entitled to the respectful consideration of this Association. I am happy to say that Professor Hart will present in person the recommendations of this Committee, and will open this discussion.

PROFESSOR ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, of Harvard University : The report which accompanies and supports these resolutions seems lucid and convincing to any candid mind. It puts into a practical, workable form a remedy for evident defects in the teaching of history. It is not my purpose to reiterate its reasoning, but simply to summarize what is suggested concerning

the duty of the schools and of the colleges, and to state what seems to be the real issue involved in this whole question of history teaching.

As a preliminary let me say that the report takes for granted a body of principles supposed to be self-evident : namely, that history is a scientific subject to be treated from a scientific point of view ; that it is a proper study for young minds ; that it requires to be spread over several years in order to give the mind time to ripen upon it ; that it requires an apparatus of books, maps, and illustrative material ; that it can be taught only by teachers acquainted with the subject ; that it is a desirable subject for secondary schools ; and that it should be a part of the preparation for college. If these axioms are granted, there is little need of argument. But prevalent practice is in contravention of such assumptions. In many schools, history is a memory subject, crowded into a year or half year, taught by persons unqualified and sometimes unwilling.

What can the schools do to bring about the millennium ? The Conference lays down only two essentials,—a minimum of two substantial years of three exercises a week, and plentiful written work. It further strongly urges three other reforms,—the study of history during four substantial years, Greek and Roman history for everybody, and one year of intensive study. In the details it recommends freedom and variety, and a choice of historical subjects according to the opportunities of the schools. The minimum of two years is a slight increase, but still a modest one in view of the time demanded for Greek and Latin, for instance. The maximum of four years is an innovation, but it has the sanction of the Madison Conference and of the Committee of Ten, and would be welcomed by many schools if their four years of work could be counted for entrance to college. The choice of subjects, while giving a wide range, does not include “general history,” which seems to the Conference not a beginner’s task, but more properly the work of one who has previously studied the simple history of particular countries. The emphasis is laid on Greek

and Roman history, not because these are valuable adjuncts to the classics, nor because they are commonly accepted at college, but because they are, next to the life of one's own country, the most significant parts of the history of the race, and so ought to be a portion of the heritage of every child. The intensive study recommended is not "research" such as Parkman employed in his laborious comparison of manuscripts, but consists in trying to get at the bottom of a thing by means of a little collection of secondary material, backed up by the few printed records and contemporary writings available. The object of the method is not to make historians, but to teach children to select the essentials out of a mass, and to train the judgment. It is simply elementary laboratory work in consonance with the most approved methods of experimental science. The written work recommended is already done in the best schools, and needs no defence. The object sought in urging it is the same that is derived from themes in English, from Greek and Latin composition, from original problems in algebra; it is the way to put children on their feet. It encourages reflex action; it leads to accuracy, the weighing of evidence, aptness of literary expression, and readiness to draw from the stores of the mind.

If the schools need to be more insistent on history, the colleges have the corresponding duty of receiving it more kindly. To judge by their requirements, they look on history as a poor relation of the classics. Of fifteen New England colleges and technical schools, eleven require Greek and Roman history; nine require or allow American history; five, English history; and one, mediæval and European history. With a single exception, they all ask for at least two of the seven "points" enumerated in Resolution I, as suitable preparation for college. The enforcement of these requirements is, to say the least, not strenuous. No college is successful if it attempts to distinguish rational and thorough teaching from cram. The schools which teach history well have no special advantage in meeting the college requirements over those which neglect the subject.

This report opens up to the colleges two spheres of beneficent activity ; they are asked to count well-taught history in any two or more of the seven fields ; and they are asked to get such tests as will measure good work. By granting the first request, they will make allowance for schools which can better teach a considerable quantity of history than some other subjects, and will give one more stroke in the process of welding together secondary and higher education. In acceding to the second request, they are invited to insist on written work and to enforce good class room work by examinations which require judgment. If the colleges are not willing to make the history requirement effective, let them abandon it, and do the work of elementary teaching themselves.

The issues involved in the report, however, are more serious than a programme, more complicated than a method, and deeper than a test. Better teaching in history is tangled up with the whole question of reform and readjustment of the secondary school programme. The remedy proposed depends for its final success on others than the schools and the colleges. The public at large must be convinced that history requires careful, troublesome, and expensive teaching. The requirements mentioned in the report recognize the English High Schools as competent to prepare for college, so far as history is concerned. The colleges have an interest (of which they have apparently been unaware) in establishing even partial relations with the 2,000 high schools and 700 academies in which Greek is not taught. So thousands of pupils have also an interest in good teaching, which would be more likely to prevail if even a small number of them could eventually count it toward entrance to college. Certainly the scheme outlined in the resolutions is flexible, does not disturb existing conditions, and is widely applicable.

While the time required under the proposed plan involves an increase over the time usually given to history, that increase is not large. There are required three exercises a week for two years, instead of four or five a week during one year.

The increase, if it presses, can be met by putting back into the lower schools subjects now taught in the high schools, as physics, geometry, algebra, or the languages. In the English High Schools there is time for history in the gaps left by Greek. History deserves that time for it should be found. Teachers of this subject and of science have no interest in diluting education by leaving out the classics, but they do claim for their subjects as much consideration as though they could appeal to centuries of prescription.

Undeniably the training methods advocated in the resolutions are hardly twenty-five years old in American colleges, and are just beginning to percolate into schools. Parallel reading, systematic written work, weekly questions, careful notes, judgment—compelling examinations—these are by no means seated methods even in colleges. But other methods are also new,—sight translation in language, original demonstration in geometry, and laboratory experiments in physics. Yet who can doubt that these methods for developing individuality are permanent? Twenty-five years hence no good college or school will know that there are less searching ways of studying history. If twenty years of this quarter century can be saved, let us speed the plow.

Another difficulty arises from the fact that we have not a body of teachers trained to do this work. This is only a temporary condition. It will pass away as soon as teachers of history are required to be as well trained for their distinctive work as are teachers of Latin. Specialization will hasten the time, since it is possible for the teacher whose effort is concentrated to gain much after entering the work.

Another serious question is how this quantity of written work is to be handled and corrected. The better the teacher the more need for relief from the mechanical part of the calling. As in experimental physics, the study is impossible except in small classes; this means more teachers, but not all of the same degree of experience or ability. Perhaps there is a fruitful system to be built up of young assistants, not yet prepared to be

responsible teachers, yet relatively much more advanced than the pupils, and capable of managing the details of written work. From such assistants would develop some of the trained specialist teachers.

In the long run the success of the scheme depends upon the public. Perhaps that despot does not yet understand that history is to be taught well only by good, highly educated, specially prepared teachers, and that unless he can have books,—more books, shelves of books, libraries of books,—and other illustrative material, the best teacher of history is handicapped ; but this is the plain truth. There is nothing, however, for which the taxpayers so cheerfully expend money as for their schools. They have only to be convinced of the need, to show their readiness to meet it. What is more likely to lead people to give freely for such objects than the deliberate judgment of this body that history must be as well taught as Greek or English, and that the necessary teachers and material must be provided ?

PRESIDENT SEELYE : Mr. Arthur L. Goodrich, principal of the Salem High School, has been requested to continue the discussion. After this speaker the discussion will be opened to the members of the Association.

MR. ARTHUR L. GOODRICH : With due regard for exceptional cases, where carefully unified programmes have long been used or are just coming in touse, it may safely be asserted that the curricula of our secondary schools are overcrowded and badly organized. They lack unity as wholes, and the individual subjects lack continuity. This condition has arisen mainly from two causes : college requirements and the public demand. College requirements havenot heretofore been such that preparation for them was at the same time the best preparation for those who could go no further. In a vague, uncertain way, the general public feels that the classical schools and courses do not equip the youth with either the knowledge or the power he ought to have. Unable through ignorance to make itself effective in any other way, this feeling generally finds expression in obstruction. The means to carry out the work well is granted grudgingly,

meagerly, or not at all. And yet in no department of public expense is support as willingly and unstintedly given provided reasons are understood and aims appreciated. The necessity which rests upon the school of meeting both demands, that of the college and that of the public, results in confusion and distress. This condition is aggravated by the lack of vitality and breadth in the elementary schools, which has resulted in pushing forward into the secondary period far too much which ought at least to begin in the elementary. Any step which tends to relieve this condition will be welcomed by teachers, parents, and pupils, and will be accepted as soon as it is fairly understood. The report of the Committees of Ten and Fifteen have somewhat cleared the ground, and have not only made it possible to attack the problem in detail, but have given to the attack the probability of success. The attempt to relegate some matters to the elementary period will undoubtedly result in good, if wisely managed, but let us not deceive ourselves as to its amount. The matter of the teaching of English has been taken up, and, I am afraid, disposed of for the present. I do not consider it as settled in any sense, for it has been considered mainly with reference to college requirements. Nevertheless, an advance has been made, and the rest will doubtless follow in time. History teaching has come next, and the report of our Committee is before us. To it I for one give hearty assent. In what I have to say by way of discussion I do not propose to raise objections to the plan as a whole, but to criticise a few details in resolutions I and II, and then make two comments, one on resolution III, the other on a part of the report aside from the resolutions.

My criticisms are as follows : 1. The first topic under resolution I does not appear to me to be definite enough. I assume that the destruction of Corinth is the point at which our committee would have us pause, but the history of Greece from 323 B. C. to 146 B. C. is confused, and valueless to any except specialists. The study of Greek history in secondary schools ought to end with the death of Alexander.

2. The second item under resolution I includes too much. The history of the Teutonic outgrowth is not the history of Rome, nor of the Roman people. It belongs to the history of modern European nations. This topic ought to end not later than the downfall of the Western Empire in 476 A. D.

3. The idea involved in the second resolution is just. On

p. 13 of their report our Committee make plain the need of some modification of the present method. But why take a half-step? Why not strike out the third word and have done with it? I am of the opinion that college examiners have already as much manuscript to read as they are, or as any other person would be, qualified to read intelligently and criticise justly. From the point of view of the secondary school I can see no valid objection to the plan and am quite willing to vote for it, if our college friends desire, but what good reason is there for such an increase of labor? Why not prescribe the amount and kind of work to be done and then accept certificates outright from schools whose courses you know to be adequate and whose teachers you can trust to be honest and fearless.

With these few criticisms on minor points, perhaps wrong, certainly capable of remedy if the criticisms are justified, and after acknowledging the excellence of the scheme in itself, let us pass to some comments not precisely affecting details.

1. Digests, parallels, investigations and reports are rather formidable undertakings for the immature. Immaturity is, however, a rapidly diminishing quantity in youth of the secondary school age, and work of the kind indicated in resolution III, ought not to be neglected, but let us not treat the matter too lightly, nor expect too much. I do not believe this subject can be handled with anything like the ease expected by enthusiasts. I wish our committee could have found more space in which to make clear both the educational value of history and its intrinsic difficulty. Such exposition is necessary for a reason involved in what I have already said, namely, that many teachers, and most parents and pupils, regard the subject merely as a collection of facts, some of which (especially those concerning our own country,) it is well to know. It is not easy, for instance, to convince parents and pupils that any study of Greek and Roman History is of great advantage educationally. To persuade them to put two whole years upon it will be harder still. In fact, if we wish these subjects taught in the manner and to the extent suggested, we must gain the assent of those whom we wish to have receive it—a matter which obtains altogether too little attention in our educational discussions. To me history appears to be an inextricable medley of things easy and things difficult for young minds. The permanently interesting and really useful parts are too abstruse, while the rest is either too dry or too remote.

This objection has progressively less weight as the youth gains in maturity, but for a considerable part of the secondary school age the "catalogue of facts" lacks interest, the "story" has lost much of its charm, while the rest is only feebly understood. But the subject deals with exactly the kind of problem the boy when grown will have to deal with every day, namely, to balance evidence, and to reason safely from uncertain data. Mathematics gives pure models of form in reasoning as nothing else does or can, but the premises of the mathematical syllogism are certain, while those of the historical are uncertain. The evil outcome of false reasoning, the mixed results of reasoning which is partly good and partly bad, the ultimate triumph of right, the far-reaching consequence of wrong, the value of courage and character, the disastrous results of feebleness and cowardice—all these and more are mirrored for us in history with an uncompromising exactness that is all the more convincing because these things are not the products of imagination but are deeds done, rewards received, and punishment suffered by human beings like ourselves. This objection, then, sure as I am of it and grave as I feel it to be, ought not, in my opinion, to deprive us of a subject whose content is so valuable. But abundant information and the greatest skill must be characteristics of the teacher who would make the pupil feel effectively the permanent interest which certainly inheres in the subject.

2. Let us now cease considering history by itself, range it up alongside the other subjects of the curriculum and examine the result. Well, trouble is the result, and there will be more trouble when other subjects come to be discussed and planned in the same thorough way. It is the same difficulty which confronted the Committee of Ten when the Conference reports came in. Given 25 hours how can we put $37\frac{1}{2}$ hours into them? Or, perhaps more accurately, given a brain of a certain capacity, how can we put into it one-half more than it will hold? This difficulty was met by the Committee of Ten, and has been met by our Committee, by mutilation. The attempt, for example, to insert the course recommended into the programmes of the Committee of Ten has resulted, in all but one, in a serious break in continuity. To illustrate, take the classical programme—a poor enough programme, perhaps, for a classical programme, but not helped nor harmed in the least by the curious protest of the American Philological Association.

In this programme it is proposed to take Greek and Roman history successively for the first two years and then drop the subject for a year at the end of which the pupils are to be examined for admission to college. If honestly carried out, this can result only in disaster. If dishonestly carried out, it means an additional hour or two per week for reviews in the third year which ought in fairness to appear on an already overcrowded programme.

But are we really compelled to resort to mutilation? Is there no other alternative? The doctrine of election has made its way down from university to college, from college to secondary school, and is now demanding recognition in schools below. It is still a mooted question as to what form election should have at various stages or what precautions should be taken lest liberty become license, but, accepting the doctrine without discussing here its modifications, let me ask if there be anything peculiar about college entrance examinations by reason of which it should not have play in them? Would not Harvard, for example, obtain better material for her work, if she called for ten hours of examination instead of seventeen, and insisted on such preparation as would be made if courses like the one we are discussing were properly carried out? The quantity required is already too great for proper treatment in the time available, and we are proposing a kind of preparation which will inevitably call for more time still. If we are to do our work better, that is, if we are to prepare our pupils better, we, or more accurately they, must have less to do. The college can solve the whole difficulty, if it will, by demanding less quantity and better quality. Admit the principle of election in your requirements, insist on a few fundamentals, if you will, or if you can find out what they are, and then provide an abundance of electives without demanding too many of them. Then and only then will it be possible in preparatory schools to carry out such courses as this recommended by our Conference. Then and only then can we either as schools or as pupils elect subjects instead of courses. Then and only then can we present at the doors of the college pupils whose preparation satisfies us, and if it satisfies us the colleges may rest assured that it will satisfy them.

I can see but two objections to this from the point of view of the college: (1) A fear lest it result in deterioration in scholarship; (2) the necessity of considerable modification in college administration. As to the first, I am unable to see

why thorough preparation in fewer things will not advance scholarship rather than injure it. As to the latter—what of it? There is nothing fixed about college administration, so far as I am aware; it is constantly changing, if it improves.

No, gentlemen, let us not mutilate these good things; let us teach everything which we undertake at all in the best way so far as we go. Throw open the doors (doors, mind you—not door) of the college and we will build the steps thereto in such manner and of such character that our common interests will be advanced, while the feet which tread those steps will not only be more in number but, what is of vastly more consequence, they will be firmly planted.

PRESIDENT SEELYE: The subject is now open for general discussion. We shall be happy to hear any of the ladies or gentlemen present who are interested in it. If Professor Start, at whose suggestion this discussion was opened, will give his views, the Association will be very glad to hear from him.

PROF. EDWIN A. START: *Mr. President*—I do not know that I have very much to add, as the ground has been covered pretty well. The report covers a good deal of it, and Dr. Hart's paper supplements that, and Mr. Goodrich has added some suggestions from the side of the schools. There were one or two comments of Mr. Goodrich that may deserve mention in behalf of the Conference. One of these is the suggestion in regard to the acceptance of certificates in relation to the written work. That, of course, is a matter of detail. But I would call your attention to the fact that the report of the Conference on page 13 covers that particular point. We say in a very few words all, I think, that needs to be said, from the point of view of the Conference, in regard to certificates. The acceptance of certificates is a matter for the individual college to consider for itself. What the arrangements of colleges accepting certificates may be, if this plan goes into effect, seems not to be essential to the case. As to the comments on the first two subjects in the first resolution, I may say in regard to No. 1 that the Conference thought it was unnecessary to fix specific limits for the year's study. The course in Greek history usually pursued is about the same, and it seemed to us to make very little difference whether the individual school carried it

beyond the time of Alexander or not. We did feel, in regard to No. 2, that there was a matter for consideration, and we amended our original proposition, which did not include the period later than the fall of the Empire. We felt that there was in the period so often known as the "Dark Ages," between the fall of the old Empire and the rise of the new Western Empire, a lesson which should be taught in order to develop at the outset a conception of historical continuity, and that it could be done best in connection with Roman history; that an attempt should be made here to follow out the lines laid down by Bryce and Freeman, and give an idea of Roman history in its entirety, bringing it into its relation with the history of Europe. To do that, we could see no better way than to have the year given to the study of Roman history carry the work on to 800 A. D., which would make such a connection, and put the pupil in condition to understand later European developments.

A perfectly proper criticism has been offered of the courses proposed in the tabular view on page 9, in which we suggest the application of the proposals of the Conference to the programmes of the Committee of Ten. Please to bear in mind all the qualifications that we make, in submitting this scheme. We take no responsibility, I think, for the programmes of the Committee of Ten. We make no comments on them. We do not offer these as ideal programmes. We have attempted to present our model history programmes on the preceding page. We take the programmes of the Committee of Ten as we find them and show how the proposed requirements can be fitted to them. We knew at the time this report was prepared that certain schools were considering those programmes, and it seemed to us that we could take them as typical of programmes in use, or likely to be adopted by various schools, and show how, in an imperfect way, this plan could be fitted in with such arrangements. We do not like the result. We have said, on page 7, that "the Conference urges the need, from both the practical and the educational standpoints, of such continuous four-year courses in history." That is the position of the Conference, and the other is simply an alternative, an imperfect alternative, to be taken only where we cannot get a perfect thing. That is all that tabular view on page 9 stands for.

It has been suggested that not enough is said in the report on the general question of the character and value of history.

I suppose the Conference would have liked very well to submit a learned disquisition on the value of history as a study, and I wish we might have done it, but this report seemed to be hardly the place for it; it already filled about 20 pages of printed matter, and we felt that was about enough for a report of this kind. A discussion of the value of the subject seemed—except as it has come in incidentally—a little outside of our province, under the circumstances. We have to assume, I suppose, whether correctly or not, that the educational and practical value of history is recognized in a body like that before which this report comes; and the report is prepared for this body, and not for the general public. I hope the time has come when it is not necessary to say to educators that history deserves, and must have, a high place, a substantial recognition, in our courses of study, from the beginning. I hope that this matter will be looked at in a broad way, and not from a merely technical point of view. I hope it will not be looked at entirely from the point of view of the existing curriculum, and the necessity of fitting this subject in, and placing it, on account of the crowded condition of things, in a corner somewhere. It seems to me that we may ask now, those of us who are interested in history, that its place be recognized beside other subjects, and that the curriculum, if necessary, be entirely reformed in order to give it that place, if an entire reform is the only means by which it can be done, and I think it is the only means by which it can be done properly. Let us find a place for it. I hope that the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools will be prepared to look at the matter in that way. Of course, it is not a matter of to-day or to-morrow. It is a matter for careful consideration. As Professor Hart has said, it is something more than a question of programmes, or of methods; it touches vital educational principles; but that is all the more reason why we should begin the work of adjustment now.

DR. JOHN TETLOW, of the Girls' High and Latin Schools, Boston: *Mr. Chairman*—The subject assigned for discussion this afternoon interests me more than anything else on the programme. If it had not been for this subject, I should hardly have felt that I could come here. But as Principal of a preparatory school, I realized that I could not afford to stay away from this discussion. I read the report of the Conference on History, when it came to me about a fortnight ago, with the

greatest interest. I laid it down with the feeling that, if the Association should commit itself to the recommendations there made, it would commit itself to a substantial increase of the present requirements for admission to college. We cannot afford to look at questions of this kind as Professor Start has just asked us to do, without any reference to existing requirements, or existing programmes. On the contrary, we have got to consider every recommendation with which we are confronted with special reference to its bearing on existing requirements and existing programmes. I laid this pamphlet down with a feeling that, if this were an essay presented at an educational meeting, on which nothing depended, I should go away, after listening to the reading of it, stimulated by it; and, if I were a teacher of history, I should go back to my work feeling that I had got fresh inspiration from what I had heard. But this is an Association formed, not merely to give inspiration to its members; it is an Association formed to accomplish practical ends: to make recommendations that are both sound and feasible, and to do all in its power to lead the colleges to accept and enforce them, and the schools to come up to the full level of what they involve.

Now, I cannot vote, when this question comes to be voted upon, for recommendations that I know call for a substantial addition to the present requirements for admission to college. I am in the legitimate business of preparing girls thoroughly for college, not in the business of cramming them for examinations: and, because here and there some private tutors succeed in cramming a boy or a girl in a short time to pass a given examination, that is no reason why I should be discouraged in my legitimate work by being overwhelmed with requirements that I cannot possibly meet. I feel it my duty to protest against excessive demands. Now, it seems to me that what is recommended here is self-contradictory; perhaps that is too strong a term, but what I mean is that what one resolution recommends, another renders impossible. We are asked to do so much in Roman History, and so much in Grecian History, and to do it in a particular way; but the amount called for is so great that it is impossible for us to do the work in that way. It is, perhaps, too early in this discussion to offer any motion, but before the discussion comes to an end, I shall wish to ask that Resolution 1, subdivision 1, be amended by the addition of the words "to the death of Alexander"; that subdivision 2 of the same resolution be amended by the substitution of "to the

accession of Commodus" for "and Teutonic outgrowths to 800 A. D. "; and that Resolution III be amended by the substitution of the words "at least three" for the word "each." The amendment last suggested would allow the retention of (*a*), (*b*), and any one of the three (*c*), (*d*), and (*e*). I do not think we ought to ask the colleges to force upon us more than we can do well. If we are to adopt resolutions and ask the colleges to base their admissions upon them, let us weigh the matter carefully, and not undertake what we cannot perform.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : Professor Channing, of Harvard University, is present, I believe, and interested in this subject. We shall be glad to hear him.

PROFESSOR EDWARD CHANNING : *Mr. President*—It is very kind of you to ask me to speak ; but I have not come prepared to say anything on the matter in hand. As to the general spirit of the Conference's recommendations there can be but one opinion among historical students and teachers. They are admirable. Indeed, they are in some respects almost too good. The gentlemen who drew up this report live for the most part in my neighborhood ; one of them is my colleague and two others have been or are studying with me. Nevertheless, there seems to me to be a good deal to be said in favor of the criticisms that have been made by Mr. Tetlow. The death of Alexander seems to be a good place to stop the study of Greek History. As to Roman History, it is difficult to see why the Conference should have chosen the year 800 A. D. as representing the best stopping place. That was the year of the crowning of Karl the Great ; but it seems to be a good bridge for passing from one period to another, rather than a good point at which to break off the study of the subject. History is divided into periods for convenience's sake merely, not because there is any logical reason for making such divisions. The history of the period from A. D. 375 to 800 is very complicated and hard to understand. Some earlier stopping place would be much better, and the death of Commodus would appear to be as good a place as can be found. As to Resolution III, it would be as well, perhaps, to strike out the word "each" and to leave each teacher to determine when his pupils had received as much training in the exercise of their judgments as is necessary. The object to be attained is to train the judicial

faculties and not to educate children in the art of map-making or digest writing. By whatever means it is accomplished that is the most important thing to be gained from the study of history.

I am rather disappointed that there is nothing in this report as to the educational value of history ; but I am informed that the subject has been discussed over and over again. I believe that the value of history as a training-study is very little understood by our teachers and not understood at all by the taxpayers. It seems to me that if the Association desires to increase the amount of good teaching of history the best thing it could possibly do would be to tell teachers and parents the reason why it desires the change to be made ; and this the present report does not do. I thank you very much, sir, for giving me this opportunity of addressing the Association.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : I think the Association would be very glad to hear from some of its members with reference to the feasibility of introducing such courses as have been recommended for adoption into our preparatory schools. Dr. Tetlow has presented one side. Are there any present who would like to present the other ? Perhaps Dr. Huling himself, who was Chairman of this Conference, and interested in the subject, will favor us with a few words in reference to some of these matters.

DR. RAY GREENE HULING : *Mr. President*—I am very sure that all the members of the Conference, if they were here, would be entirely willing to accept Mr. Tetlow's amendments to the resolution, in the exact form in which he has offered them. The question of the limit to which the study of the history of Greece should be carried is one on which there would naturally be differences of judgment among teachers, even in the same school ; and I should hope that any college which should set any limit in such a study would expect the teacher who has the class before him to determine for himself where that class should stop in the time at his disposal. That is one of the elements of freedom which the teacher of every class ought to have, under every principal, it seems to me. In general, we know that the history of Greece ends, so far as the advantage to the scholar is concerned, at the end of that which is specially

and distinctively Greek civilization. Some might be willing to lay the stress mainly upon the age of Pericles, and have very little to do with the subsequent century. Most of us, I think, would prefer to go so far as the limit that has been mentioned, the death of Alexander.

With reference to the second amendment, there is no objection to closing Roman History with the accession of Commodus, unless there are some who still hope to bridge over the space between the history of Rome and the beginning of modern history. That could be done, even if it were not prescribed in the requirements for the college, by a hasty examination of the intervening period, and there seems to be no objection on that score to taking the amendment just as it has been suggested. And so with regard to the third resolution. I am very sure that those who have to receive the graduates of the secondary schools would be delighted if they could find evidence in those who come to them for Freshman history, that they have had genuine, earnest practice in as many as three of the five kinds of work that are suggested here ; and any teachers who should find it possible to give practice in the whole five, would be entirely at liberty to do so, with the happy result that their pupils would be better prepared for the college examination, and for college work. Personally I should be willing also to accept Mr. Goodrich's amendment with regard to the second resolution, namely, that satisfactory work done in the secondary school and certified by the teacher should constitute a considerable part of the evidence of proficiency required by the college. I do not think, however, that the Conference as a whole, and possibly not a majority of them, would favor the certificate system of entrance. It seems to *me* that this is the ideal plan, because it throws the decision with regard to the fitness of the pupil upon the set of persons who know most about that pupil's fitness, having had the best opportunities to test it through a series of years. We are not prepared, however, in the present condition of feeling on the part of several colleges and preparatory schools in New England to advocate the certificate system in history until it has been adopted generally in all requirements. With respect to the other matter which has been mentioned,—the feasibility of introducing into the secondary schools the methods recommended in the resolutions,—there is this to be said : In many secondary schools it cannot be successfully attempted with the present equipment of teachers and of libraries, and in the present

state of preparation on the part of teachers. There are classes, however, which are doing work of just this character, and doing it well. There are teachers of history who have thoroughly prepared themselves for their specific work. There are school committees who are looking intelligently and earnestly into the question of supplying the necessary books and of providing teachers in sufficient number to enable this sort of work to be done. If we to-day adopt these recommendations as our ideal, we shall further the whole movement toward improvement in the teaching of history, encouraging the hearts of good teachers, and giving direction to the thoughts of those members of the school committees who keep in touch with the advance of educational sentiment. For this reason I think it eminently wise that these resolutions, with the amendments which have been suggested by Dr. Tetlow, should receive the sanction of this body. I would move therefore, that these resolutions, so amended, be now adopted by this Association.

PRESIDENT SEELYE :—Is this motion of Dr. Huling's seconded?

DR. TETLOW :—I second the motion.

MR. GOODRICH :—I should like to ask for a little more definite statement from the Conference in regard to the third resolution. Does it really intend that the written work spoken of in resolution II, shall consist of samples of *all* the kinds specified?

DR. HULING :—Yes, sir.

MR. GOODRICH :—Will the Committee, or any member of it, state plainly why they considered it necessary for the schools to send up samples of all these kinds of written work?

DR. HULING :—Simply to make sure that there had been intelligent practice in all these kinds of work. Each of the five processes implied under these headings involves something which is of value to the student of history in his later course; hence it is thought that evidence of having acquired some facility in the use of them all would be best manifested by the presentation of written work which had shown to the teacher power of analysis in them all.

MR. GOODRICH : The Committee then would not consider it sufficient if it read as follows : “ That the written work of the secondary schools should include abundant practice in each of the following ? ”

DR. HULING : The answer to that question would, perhaps, better come from a member of the Conference who looks at the subject from the point of view of the college. I will ask Professor Hart what his reply would be to that suggestion ?

PROF. HART : *Mr. Chairman*—It would seem as though Mr. Goodrich's questions angled off in the direction of a suggestion that written work was an incomplete means of testing the amount of preparation, and a great labor to the examiner. To that objection it is a simple answer that a similar system is in use for physics. For determining whether a candidate passes in that subject there are three criteria : A book examination, a laboratory examination, and the note-book of the candidate. It is a great deal of trouble to get these three elements all in ; but it is one of the most satisfactory tests in the set of examinations for Harvard college, and I make bold to say that any college that desires to enforce written work in history, will have no serious difficulty. It is a question not of possibility but of expense, and no great expense at that. It means simply that a few more examiners must be on hand during the days of examination, and that a final decision cannot be reached till the note-books come in. I suppose any sensible college in administering a system of this kind, would choose for itself what portions of written work it desired to have sent up *en bloc* for examination, and of what portions it would take significant examples, as showing the kind of work that the teachers were pursuing. I will say further that this is a method which I should personally be very glad to see introduced into Harvard College. Doubtless many of you know that a committee has been raised to consider the general subject of entrance requirements for Harvard, and that some changes are probably impending. A resolution of this kind, endorsed by the Association, will strengthen the hands of those who would like to see Harvard College establish a more rational system for admission examinations. Doubtless the requirements here suggested do mean more work. At present, however, the preparation of boys in Greek and Roman history is ordinarily nothing but

a cramming process, and does not indicate fitness for entrance to college. If that is all we can get for entrance I should prefer to see the requirement stricken out altogether. It does not aid us in historical teaching in the colleges. There are schools, like Dr. Tetlow's, that are doing solid and suitable work, and which ought readily, with their present teaching, to prepare in any two of the seven points suggested here, and, therefore, ought to be able to send good written work. The schools that are not doing the kind of work which requires two years are schools that are not getting any good out of history.

MR. GOODRICH : Professor Hart has spoken the truth in regard to much of the preparation in Greek and Roman history. Its time allotment is too limited to permit the best methods. All will agree to this. Permit me to say further that I do not want to be understood as being opposed to the study of history. I heartily approve of it and am thoroughly convinced of the possible utility of the subject. But I cannot get out of my mind, not the Harvard examiners, but the victim, that is the boy and the young girl. I cannot get out of my mind, as we pass one set of resolutions of this kind after another concerning English last year and history this, that it all means an increase in work. The new Harvard requirements in English, for instance, involved more labor than the old, and if these suggestions in regard to history are adopted more labor still will be involved. I do object strongly in behalf of the pupil to the additional labor he will be compelled by these changes to undertake during the four or five years elapsing between the elementary school and the door of the college. Every step of this kind, as Dr. Tetlow has well said, involves additional work for the pupil. I do not care what it involves for us ; it involves additional work for *him*, and we must look to it that in our zeal for excellent methods we do not forget the limitations which surround our youth. I see no escape from the danger I fear except in the method I have suggested, namely, that we shall come eventually to elect subjects and not courses. In regard to this particular thing, let me ask one question further : was Dr. Huling's motion to amend intended to include what Dr. Tetlow said about the third resolution ?

DR. HULING : Yes, sir.

MR. GOODRICH : Then I have no more to say.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : Are you ready for action upon this motion. Is there anything else to be said? I will ask Dr. Huling to read the resolutions as amended, if he will be kind enough, so that there may be a clear understanding of the resolutions.

DR. HULING : (Reads)

I. *Resolved*, That the colleges be requested to include in their requirements for admission a choice of subjects out of the following topics:*

- (1) The history of Greece to the death of Alexander, with especial reference to Greek life, literature, and art.
- (2) The History of Rome: the Republic and the Empire to the accession of Commodus.
- (3) German History[†] To be so taught as to elucidate the general movement of mediæval and modern history.
- (4) French History)
- (5) English History, with especial reference to social and political development.
- (6) American History, with the elements of Civil Government.[†]
- (7) A detailed study of a limited period, pursued in an intensive manner.

—any two of these topics to constitute a required subject for entrance to college. The colleges are earnestly requested to accept any additional topic or topics from the list as additional preparation for entrance or for advanced standing.

II. *Resolved*, That satisfactory written work done in the secondary school, and certified by the teacher, should constitute a considerable part of the evidence of proficiency required by the college.

III. *Resolved*, That such written work should include some practice in at least three of the following :

- (a) Notes and digests of the pupil's reading, outside the text-books.
- (b) Written recitations requiring the use of judgment and the application of elementary principles.
- (c) Written parallels between historical characters or periods.
- (d) Brief investigations of topics limited in scope, prepared outside the class-room, and including some use of original material.
- (e) Historical maps or charts, made from printed data and comparison of existing maps, and showing movements of exploration, migration, or conquest, territorial changes, or social phenomena.

*The Conference expects that for any one of the seven topics one year's work of at least three periods a week, or an equivalent, would be necessary.

†It is expected that the study of American History will be such as to show the development and origin of the institutions of our own country; that it will, therefore, include the colonial beginnings; and that it will deal with the period of discovery and early settlement sufficiently to show the relations of peoples on the American continent, and the meaning of the struggle for mastery.

IV. *Resolved*, That the examinations in history for entrance to college ought to be so framed as to require comparison and the use of judgment on the pupil's part, rather than the mere use of memory. The examinations should presuppose the use of good text-books, collateral reading, and practice in written work. Geographical knowledge should be tested by requiring the location of places and movements on an outline map.

DR. HULING :—I trust, Mr. President, that before the question is put to a vote we shall have the pleasure of hearing from other teachers with respect to this matter. Mr. Sanford, of Brookline, is present. I see in the audience Dr. Hill, Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education ; Mr. Fish, Mr. Amen, and Miss Whipple of the Worcester English High School, where history is taught in much the same manner as is recommended here. I hope there will be further discussion.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : I am sure the Association will be very glad to hear from the teachers whose names have been mentioned, if they will favor us with a few words in reference to the resolutions. I would call on Dr. Hill.

DR. HILL : *Mr. President*—I am delighted in the main, with the report of the Committee, and with the resolutions that accompany it. If I express hearty sympathy with the amendments proposed, it must not be supposed that it is because of a lack of sympathy with the report as a whole. This report recognizes conditions that exist in the general courses of our Massachusetts high schools. I am particularly anxious that the gap between these high schools, in their general courses, and the colleges shall be closed up. Personally, I feel somewhat sensitive about any movements that threaten to widen that gap. I am very much afraid that if the quantity of requirements for admission to college in history is increased, or if there is a lack of adaptability in such requirements, the gap will be widened. The amendments tend to bring the high schools and the colleges nearer together, and so I favor them. This Association is on record as favoring a closer connection between the colleges and the high schools all along the upper line. The importance of having this closer connection is very great indeed. Our high schools are growing very rapidly ; unless this connection is established, it seems to me that the colleges will lose part of their hold on the public, or, at least, fail to get a hold where it is important they should have it. Certainly our high schools will suffer much in not having a

strong influence descending down upon all their courses from the colleges above. Whatever we do, let us try very hard to establish this close connection. I have just alluded to the growth of our high schools, and that is a legitimate subject to touch, because as they grow the importance of making this connection increases. The city of Cambridge, for instance, in 1886, had 550 high school pupils ; to-day she has 1,100. The population has increased about 30 per cent., but the high school pupils have doubled, the increase being largely in the general English courses, so called. The city of Chelsea nine years ago had 200 pupils in the High School. To-day there are 400 pupils. The population of Chelsea has increased about 20 per cent. Take the city of Worcester. Ten years ago there were 500 pupils in the High School there. To-day I understand that there are 1,300 high school pupils in that city ; yet the population of Worcester has increased but 40 per cent. during these years. In Concord, ten years ago, there were 75 or 80 pupils in the High School. To-day, I am told, there are 175. Concord has increased in population less than 40 per cent. during the decade. I venture to say that this extraordinary increase in high school pupils is a very common one ; it is very largely in the general courses. I beg of this Association to take no action that shall widen the gulf between the colleges and our high schools in these general courses. Indeed, I think that we need a certain indulgence for some little time to come, at least so far as the quantity of requirements is concerned. I like this report. I believe in the spirit of it ; and if I plead for the adoption of the amendments, I do not wish to be understood as withholding my general commendation of the work of the Conference.

MR. START : May I ask Mr. Hill if in mentioning the general courses he refers to the courses of the English high schools, to those not distinctively college preparatory ?

DR. HILL : Yes.

MR. START : I think I am right in saying that nearly all high schools of this class provide such courses as meet the requirements of these resolutions, and one hope that the Conference had, one object that it had in presenting this plan, was to bring the colleges nearer to the English high schools. Graduates of such schools are now credited with a considerable

amount of history, which is of no help to them if they wish to enter college. The adoption of the Conference plan will enable them to secure credit for this work from the colleges.

DR. HILL : As the gentleman has just said, the report seems to recognize, more or less, the English high school as well as what have been known as the non-preparatory courses of our high schools in general. I am simply suggesting that we shall not make any mistake in asking too much of them—that is all.

PROFESSOR HART : This is a subject very near to me; therefore I should simply like to say that one purpose which the Conference had most at heart, was to give a better chance for the high schools that did not habitually prepare for college. For instance, there is a little high school in Pembroke, Massachusetts, with perhaps 40 pupils. That school has a thorough four years' course in history, and perhaps a little Latin. For pupils of that school who may go somewhere else for an extra year later, every minute which they have spent on history would, under the resolution, be an advance along the line towards the college. If colleges will go so far as to accept additional history as two more points for entrance, or as a point on advanced standing, they will further stimulate such schools; for they could get credit for all the four years' work instead of two. The proposition tends to bring the colleges and high schools into better relations.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : Miss Whipple has been referred to as being able to state the condition of things in the Worcester English High School.

MISS WHIPPLE : I came as a guest with no expectation of sharing in these deliberations. With the inspiration of a Harvard summer course some years ago, I have been trying for three years to carry out this plan of work. We have a four years' course in history in the English High School in Worcester, and I am confident that we have had some success in applying these principles, and that our encouragement is sufficient to lead us to continue in the work. If the colleges can agree to allow a certain number of subjects to be offered, history should be one. I do most heartily concur in the recommendations of this report, but I think with Mr. Goodrich that we must consider the boys and girls. I am continually em-

barrassed with my delight in their good work and my fear of their over-work. They study so willingly and gladly that they often need restraint. I hope that history will be recognized by the colleges and schools, and that these methods, which certainly can be used, and are used successfully in some schools, will be duly approved by this Association.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : Mr. Sanford's name was mentioned.

MR. D. S. SANFORD, of the High School, Brookline, Mass. : I do not know that I have anything to add to the discussion. As master of a school that prepares for college, I favor the amendment, because I believe that the amount required for admission to college should not be materially increased.

The broader treatment and better methods which these resolutions aim to promote are surely to be encouraged.

As master of a high school in which there are many pupils who have no thought of going to college, I heartily commend the spirit of the resolutions and rejoice in the options allowed. For such pupils it will be a distinct advantage. As it is now, these non-classical students are at a great *disadvantage*, if, late in their high school course, they decide to prepare for college. They may have done very excellent work in history, but it will not aid them in entering college unless it has fallen within the narrow range of the present requirements.

Again, the necessity we are now under of studying the history of Greece and Rome, or at least reviewing it, just before the college examination is taken, constitutes a real embarrassment for us who are ambitious to work out a consistent, progressive course in history, in accordance with the suggestions of the Report of the Committee of Ten. In order to do that, we should like to introduce the history of Greece and Rome much earlier, perhaps in the grammar grades.

Now, even though we may offer attractive optional courses in history, economics, and civil government, our strongest students will not elect them. Again and again, have such pupils come to me and said : " We wish that we might take the course in Modern History or Civil Government ;" " We would like to undertake the ' intensive work ' in Local History but cannot." " The college for which we are preparing does not call for or recognize such courses."

Again, I am thoroughly in sympathy with the idea that pupils who have a marked taste and aptitude for history should

have the opportunity in the preparatory school to do more than the minimum required for entrance to college.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : I hope we shall hear a word from Mr. Fish, of Exeter.

MR. CHARLES E. FISH, of Waban, Mass. : *Mr. President—* Formerly of Exeter, but not in Exeter now. My successor, however, is present, and I am sure we shall welcome him to this Association, and shall be glad to hear from him. There is one point which we have not considered—the difficulty of securing competent teachers of history. I attended a dinner, three or four years ago, at which President Eliot outlined his ideal preparatory school. He said he would have thirty boarding houses. The school should number not over 250, and the boys should not exceed ten in any house, and each house should be presided over by a woman of culture, tact, and judgment, in fact possessing all the qualities that one would expect to find in a very rare, exceptional person. Think of looking for thirty such ladies. Some of us have experienced no little difficulty in finding one to preside over a house of that sort. The statement was made that we should not give up our instruction in history to the director of the gymnasium. Having been guilty of this very thing myself, in former years, I think the speaker's reference was to that, and I think his criticism at that time, which I now make public, that the boys were bolting history in great chunks, and not properly digesting it, was a very fitting criticism to make upon our methods. Endowed schools, I suppose, are embarrassed, at times, as much as public schools, and have difficulty in finding these rare teachers of history. Still I hope these resolutions will pass, for I believe, even as they stand without the proposed amendments, that they are very suggestive and helpful.

MR. GEORGE L. FOX, Rector of the Hopkins Grammar School, New Haven : I should like to take a brief portion of the time of the Association to express my opinion upon this subject. I think we all must feel that it is of exceeding importance and great moment, and that we ought not to be too ready, or too eager, to rush into this gap without full discussion and consideration. It does not seem to me that this discussion has been quite as spirited and animated as some other discussions which

have been carried on before this Association ; therefore I would like simply to give my opinion and my experience. I hope I shall be followed by other secondary school teachers, who will give their opinions frankly and courteously.

I am rather opposed to the resolutions, and I say this with a good deal of regret, because I know of no teacher of history whose work I admire more than that of Professor Hart. I feel a very strong sympathy with the speech of Dr. Tetlow. I hope that speech met with a large response from the secondary school part of this Association. Professor Hart, I understood him, allowed that this increased requirement will add largely to the work of the secondary schools, and if it does, unless some other change is made, and the work is lightened, I stand strongly opposed to any other addition to the requirements. I remember only yesterday that I acted as a buffer, as I sometimes do, between the teachers of my school, who were demanding more time for those particular subjects which each taught. Each teacher complained that the work in some other subject took up too much time ; and wished more time for his particular subject. It requires earnest effort to prepare boys thoroughly in the present requirements. My boys may be very much duller than some others, but I think they are a fair average, and therefore I say, in regard to any proposed increase in the requirements, in any way, at present, *Eheu jam satis* ; we have enough now. I believe we have come to the point where we must add no more for the present.

Now I do not wish to be accused of being low in my ideals. I think I am not. I do not wish to be accused of being a "moss-back" or an unreasonable conservative ; I do not think that I am. I think I am reasonable, but I believe the time has come for a halt for a short time. It is of very great importance to us. It is all very well to hitch your wagon to a star. But did you ever notice when that celestial connection has been made in teaching, what lamentable results sometimes follow ? The teacher and a few of the brightest scholars sit upon the front seats, surveying the aerial landscape and saying to themselves : "Isn't this lovely !" But the larger portion of the class are clinging to the tail-board of the wagon, with their tongues hanging out of their mouths, gasping for breath, almost ready to let go and drop into the abyss below. I have seen a young man begin as a teacher with the idea that he could turn the secondary school into a college. He would introduce college

methods of teaching for immature boys, and expect to do great things. Advice in such cases is of little use. He must learn by experience, and he soon does. The trouble was that he shot way over their heads.

The first duty of a teacher is to adapt his methods to the mental development and attainment of his class. He must get down where they are before he can lift them. Now, as secondary school teachers, we have to consider not what method can be used with a few bright scholars, but what are suitable to the average pupil of the average class. Think of the difficulties that confront the teacher in an effort to bring an average class to a reasonable degree of attainment. The fundamental trouble is stated in that delicious phrase of Prof. Lounsbury, "the infinite capacity of the human mind to resist the introduction of knowledge."

Therefore, I am cautious about trying some of these methods recommended with the immature minds commonly found in secondary schools. My experience is that there is danger in too much collateral reading, unless the pupil has a firm grasp of the main outlines and course of events in history. He loses his bearings, and becomes confused and puzzled. I was gratified to find my opinion on this point confirmed by an instructor in a college where this so called laboratory method had been much in vogue. He found that the historical knowledge of his pupils was confused and misty. The better method, in my opinion, for immature minds, is to use first one sound and reliable book, and have the pupil get a reasonable mastery of the contents. When by assimilating this he has laid a solid foundation, then he can safely branch out into collateral and discursive reading.

I think, also, that too wide a choice of elective subjects in history is allowed in this report. As a general principle I do not favor a large choice of electives in the curriculum of secondary schools. I believe that the course of a secondary school should be made up of required studies, because my experience leads me to the belief that boys in choosing electives are likely to make their choice along the line of least resistance. I have fought more than one battle to hold a boy up to stiff work, when he was inclined to turn to the flesh pots of a "soft" study.

But I am also opposed to the range of electives allowed in this report. No boy in a secondary school should be per

mitted to take French and German history in preference to American and English history. They are far less important for his future career, and much less interesting than the history of our own or the mother country. There are fewer teachers competent to teach these subjects, and they are more difficult to teach. Think of the difficulty which the average adult has in threading his way through the maze of the Middle Ages, and the chronicles of the petty principalities of central Europe.

If any history is to be added to the ordinary classical course, besides the Greek or Roman history, it should be English or American History. In preference to having the pupil take French or German History, I should much prefer to require a thorough course in civil government.

Among the recommendations proposed in this report, I am very doubtful about the wisdom of attempting with the average secondary school pupil, the study of history from original sources. I am one of those teachers mentioned by the Conference, who do not think that the secondary school is the proper sphere for much of this sort of work. Historical investigation is difficult, and requires a mature and firm mental grasp to accomplish it successfully. I have tried it, and I cannot say that I have had large results. When I think of the absurd answers on the part of pupils, which have come from attempts of this kind, and I think of the diverse conclusions reached by the different historians of the same period of history, I am quite ready to leave such work to the more mature student of the college or university.

We should consider in this matter not only the schools in favored districts of New England, with large bodies of teachers and able pupils, but the many schools scattered over the country, who are now doing good work in preparing boys for college, but find that the present requirements are a severe strain upon their powers.

With regard to this motion, I have spoken at some length because I feel strongly in this matter. I have tried to state, as clearly as I could, my opinion, first, that for the average boy, with all the distracting influences of social life and athletic sports, the present requirements for admission are all that we can stand; second, that there is great danger in trying to practise in secondary schools methods which are quite well fitted to the more mature minds of the college.

A prominent professor once said, with regard to the study of

Latin and Greek; that he felt that secondary schools often made a mistake in undue attention to aesthetic and archæological study of the ancient classic authors before the pupil had a reasonable mastery of the fundamentals of grammar and syntax. So it may be with history. I do not believe that in this Association I am alone in the opinion, that if a teacher goes outside of systematic and thorough training in the accepted facts of history, as stated by the reliable masters of the subject, and attempts in the secondary school to fool with seminary methods, or in any considerable degree with original investigation, he will be very likely to find that he has grasped at the shadow and missed the substance.

MR. H. P. AMEN, Principal of Phillips Exeter Academy : I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but I would like to say that I feel somewhat in sympathy with both sides of this matter. I think Mr. Fox has fairly stated a very strong objection, though he has expressed it in an extreme form. I think also that the report of the Conference is a movement in the right direction. I feel that I ought to be in favor of the resolutions.

DR. HULING : *Mr. Chairman*—I am very glad, as one of the Conference, that Mr. Fox has presented in this extreme form what can be said in opposition to the general tone of the resolutions. In substance, the objection is this: That the resolutions require too much time, and that they call for too great an improvement in methods. Now, I do not know how much time Mr. Fox assigns in his school to the study of history in preparation for college. It can scarcely be less than one year. May I ask him if it is less than one year?

MR. FOX : One year.

DR. HULING : We ask, in these resolutions, for three periods a week for two years, which is really one year and a fifth, with five periods a week, as subjects are taken in most high schools. This, it seems to me, is not a large increase, nor is it an excessive demand ; for pupils who are expected to do college work in history ought to have had previous training at least to this extent. It seems to me, therefore, that to oppose so slight an increase in the time given to history in the secondary schools is to manifest too great conservatism. With regard to the man-

ner of studying history, I find that my heart is chiefly in the improvement in methods which the report suggests. Not so much in the quantity prescribed ; I don't care about that. Not so very much in the time devoted to the subject. But I am very desirous that our secondary schools should do more than to secure the memorizing of facts, even of those arranged by the best compiler of school histories ; for I have a conviction that more than this must be done if the pupil is to make any valuable use whatever of his opportunities in college. Our report does not recommend such severe work as is done by mature students in college, or in the university. There is a distinction to be made between seminary work in higher institutions and library work in schools. These methods should not be over the heads of the pupils. They are to be adapted closely to the acquirements and capacity of boys and girls in the secondary school. Such work is now actually done in certain schools, is done every school day in the year. It can be done in all institutions in which the authorities are willing to provide the requisite books and to secure teachers of sufficient ability. The number of such teachers, I may add, will grow in proportion as the demand increases. The colleges supply abundant and adequate training to those who seek for it. I see nothing, therefore, in these resolutions, that we need hesitate to recommend to the schools of the country. I hope, however, that the issue will be clearly defined in our minds, and that those who are of the opinion expressed by Mr. Fox, that is to say, those who think that it is not best that there should be in our schools such marked improvement in the study of history as is contemplated here, will frankly oppose the resolutions. It seems to me it would be unfortunate if they should prevail. But if the larger number of our members really believe that the methods in history now in common use are satisfactory, and that the time now given to history is sufficient, then the vote ought to be adverse to these resolutions.

MR. FOX : *Mr. Chairman*—Mr. Huling will allow me one or two words. Of course, in a short talk, you can not state these things exactly as you would like to phrase them. But it seemed to me that he did me injustice, when he quoted me as one of those who were opposed to improved methods or improvement in the teaching of history. That is the very question at issue on which an honest difference of opinion is possi-

ble. It is just because I do not think that some of these recommendations are improvements that I oppose them. I am opposed to any additional requirements for admission to college, at the present time. I am opposed from practical, constant experience, because of appeals from parents, and appeals from teachers asking for more time for their own special work ; but I am not opposed, by any means, to much that there is contained in this pamphlet. But the point I wish to make about some of the methods recommended is this : That my own experience has been that boys or girls, in attempting to do their work in this way, lost their grip on the main lines of the subject, and became confused in their investigations. They were not mature enough, and that that is the difficulty with the average boy. I have in my senior class, almost every year, a boy who would reach college at sixteen. But the average is not that by any means. I can not grade my work to him. I have to take the average boy at 18 or 19. I would not like to appear before this Association, or be considered by Mr. Huling as being opposed to improvements in the teaching of history. I am opposed to the practical result of these resolutions. I sympathize with the difficulties that confront secondary school teachers. The teacher in Latin complains that he has not time enough, and is anxious for the full amount of time for his work ; the teacher of Greek thinks that mathematics diminishes his time, and he is anxious for his full amount of time. We cannot have all the good things in life. We cannot have them in a course of study ; we have to make selections.

MR. FISH : It seems to me that Mr. Fox's objection assumes too much in regard to the college professor. I imagine he meets with the same difficulties that Mr. Fox meets with in his classes. I remember fifteen years ago being given a private examination on the Thirty Years' War by the late Professor Torrey. The examination lasted from eight in the morning to one in the afternoon. It was an oral examination, and at the close the professor said : " Well, Mr. Fish, it must be evident to you by this time that you know nothing of the subject, but since you know as much as those whom I have already passed on the subject, it would be unfair not to pass you." So I suppose the aim of these resolutions is simply to give us a rational, scientific, and proper method of study ; and it will result in great help to us, and to all teachers of history. I believe the resolutions ought to pass.

DR. KEEP : I should like to ask whether it would be satisfactory to the Chairman of the Conference if one year were to be devoted to the study of Greek and Roman History combined, and a second year to English History. I should feel reluctant to omit a year of the study of English History from the classical course, and I would not give more time to the study of history than two years, three periods per week. Suppose Greek History were to be studied two terms and Roman History one term, and English History were to receive three hours a week through a second year.

DR. HULING : That question has been discussed in the Conference, and discussed quite earnestly. The feeling expressed on the part of the members of the Conference from the colleges was averse to uniting the pursuance of both Roman and Greek history in a single year, and that on the ground, as I now remember it, that the teachers of the classics in the colleges would object to the slight treatment thus given to those parts of history which assist so largely in the comprehension of classical literature. There may have been other considerations presented but certainly it did not seem wise to make that change. It is entirely possible under the resolutions, Dr. Keep will recognize, that English history should be taken as a substitute for either Roman or Greek history. In such a case the pupil could offer at college either Greek history and English history, or Roman history and English history.

The question of the adoption of the resolutions was then put and carried by a rising vote of 35 to 7.

After certain announcements by Professor Upton and the Secretary, the Association adjourned until evening.

In the interval the members and their guests visited the various college buildings, and were entertained at supper by the University in the armory room of Sayles Hall.

FRIDAY EVENING.

President Seelye, in calling the meeting to order, said :

We are very grateful to the speaker of the evening for coming to this meeting on so short notice, to take the place of President Schurman. I take great pleasure in introducing

Professor William Morris Davis, of Harvard College, who will now address you.

PHYSIOGRAPHY AS AN ALTERNATIVE SUBJECT FOR ADMISSION TO COLLEGE*

PROFESSOR DAVIS : In the Report of the Committee of Ten, the opinions of a hundred experts from all parts of the country are recorded as favoring the development of a high school programme primarily adapted to the needs of students who do not go to college. It follows from this that high school graduates who enter college should be examined and admitted upon such preparatory studies as are appropriate to students who do not go to college ; that serious studies, well conducted and appropriate to the later years of a high school course, should be accepted as the basis of admission to college and of college studies. It may be advisable to require certain combinations of high school studies for college admissions, but into that question I shall not enter. Accepting fully the conclusion of the Committee of Ten, my contention is simply this : All serious high studies should be accepted as affording proper preparation for college work ; physiography is a serious study appropriate to a high school course , physiography should therefore be accepted as preparation for college work and placed among the examinations—required or alternative—for admission to college.

Only the second element of this contention requires consideration here. The first is, to my mind, demonstrated by the Committee of Ten, and the last follows from the first and second. Let us, therefore, consider particularly the quality of pnysiography (or physical geography, as I should as lief call it), and its claims for the place in the high school course assigned to it in the tables of the Committee of Ten report, p. 46, 47.

At the outset, it must be admitted that physical geography is to-day a discredited subject for an admission examination to colleges or scientific schools. It is an interesting subject,

* The title for this address, hastily chosen on short notice, was " Physical Geography for Admission to College " It is here altered, so that its chief subject shall agree with the nomenclature of the Report of the Committee of Ten, and so that it shall at the outset be understood not to claim an *essential* position in college examinations.

generally enjoyed both by teachers and pupils, but the examination upon it is not regarded as formidable. Students do not consider it a serious obstacle to their admission ; professional coaches do not lay great stress upon preparation for it ; college examiners do not give great weight to it. If this small regard for the serious nature of the subject, for the discipline to be derived from it, or for the value of the tests set upon it, were a proper measure of the quality of physical geography, I should not ask a place for it among the admission examinations ; indeed, I should not then favor its retention in the high school. The small regard for the subject is probably a correct measure of its value, as now taught ; but this is only because the presentation of the subject is far below its deserts. When properly developed in the hands of competent teachers, and presented with suitable illustrative material, physiography deserves a place second to no other subject in the high school course, whether its value is measured by its inherent interest to high school pupils, by its broadening views of the world in which we live, or by its strength as a mental discipline.

These propositions find so undisputed a support from those who are familiar with the modern phase of physiography that I truly regret that the presentation of the case is not entrusted to a well-informed teacher of physics, of history, or of language. The physicist must rejoice to meet a subject in which his teaching finds so large an application. The historian must welcome a study that considers so carefully the stage and the scenery of the theatre in which his plays are presented. The linguist must for the sake of his scholars be glad that they find in physiography a discipline so unlike that which his own lessons afford. But the fashion of the day keeps each of us in his own field. It is not from the mathematicians and the philosophers, but from the classical scholars that we learn the value of Latin and Greek ; so it is left to the geographers to advocate the claims of their own subject.

Geography being the study of the earth in relation to man, physical geography, or physiography, is the study of those

features of the earth which must be understood in order to appreciate its relation to man. The essential characteristic of modern physiography is the replacement of the old-fashioned absolute or empirical descriptions of earth features by a rational and systematic treatment. Explanation of existing features as the result of natural processes is freely introduced in addition to description of the features themselves ; not however so much to gain an understanding of the processes as to secure an appreciation of the features resulting from the processes. The subject of course has its elementary, intermediate, and advanced phases, but throughout it is characterized by rational explanation as a means of approaching a closer perception of the facts of nature than can be gained by description alone. Consider, for example, the study of land forms. Studied in relation to time, the forms of the land to-day as well as in the past belong to geology or the history of the earth. But the same forms, studied in order to understand the world we live in, constitute an important division of the subject matter of physiography. The old-fashioned method of studying land forms was to describe them in absolute terms, as if they had always existed, and to take practically no account of their development. This is unsatisfactory and insufficient. To be sure, a timid and incomplete attempt was made to explain certain elementary forms, such as sand-dunes, deltas, volcanoes ; but it was not perceived as a general principle that explanation greatly aided description, and that explanation of origin should, for this reason, be systematically extended over all parts of the subject. Physiography to-day should certainly not claim to understand the origin of every land form, but it may fairly claim to understand that its duty is to press vigorously forward towards a fulness of knowledge ; and, in the meantime, it may fairly claim to understand the origin of so many forms as to supply a large amount of rational study for the high school, or even for the college. Borrowing freely from geology—just as chemistry borrows freely from physics—physiography takes up various considerations about structures and processes, and many

inheritances of the present from the past, not simply with the object of understanding these structures, or processes, or past conditions, but only as the best means of reaching the chief end ; namely, an appreciation of existing facts.

There are three chief divisions of the subject matter of physiography : the atmosphere, the oceans, and the lands. Plants and animals and their distribution do not belong under physiography, and should not be introduced into the study except so far as they, like geological processes and structures, serve to aid us in understanding the existing conditions of the earth.

The study of the atmosphere, comprising the teachings of meteorology, in so far as processes are concerned, and of climatology,* in so far as average values of recurrent sensible conditions are concerned, fully deserves recognition as an independent branch of physiography, so that it may gain half a school year for its own consideration. The last thirty years have seen a remarkable advance in this division of the subject. In the later high school years, after some study of physics, lessons from meteorology and climatology may be taught so as to present information of much interest, as well as training of much disciplinary value. The general circulation of the atmosphere is initially dependent on the distribution of temperature, but it reacts to modify temperature as well as to determine the occurrence of dry and rainy seasons and regions. When the correlations thus introduced are carefully studied and clearly understood, climatology loses the empirical quality that it long possessed and becomes a rational subject. Moreover, in the progress of this study, the pupil will be required to maintain in mind the successive steps of a somewhat elaborate

* The important subjects of meteorology and climatology may be worthily pursued by advanced specialists for their own sake, quite independent of their bearings on geography, or the study of the earth as the home of man. Selection is to be made from the results gained by these specialists, and everything pertinent to geographical considerations is to be drafted in physiography, explanation going with result on account of the aid that it gives to understanding and memory. The same may be said of oceanography, below. As any of these divisions of physiography reach higher places in the educational scale, they must be taken up more and more minutely and thoroughly, touching finally the commonplace conditions of everyday life, and not limiting discussion to subjects that determine the fate of great wars or the boundaries of empires.

argument by which a test is made of the validity of the explanations offered to account for the general atmospheric circulation and its associated processes. This is disciplinary in a high degree, and has the added advantage of illustrating a typical example of scientific method. I am confident that a course well developed from the teachings of meteorology, with due consideration of climatology, will commend itself strongly to teachers, scholars, and examiners.

The special subject of oceanography does not contribute largely to physiography, yet the temperatures of the ocean, as well as its waves, currents, and tides, are all interesting topics, capable of calling forth serious study, and leading to explanations well worth understanding. Less advance has been made during the last thirty years in the divisions of oceanography here considered than in meteorology and in the physiography of the lands; but a considerable advance has been made in methods of teaching from which the subject should largely profit. It is worth noting that the division of physical geography including ocean temperatures, together with waves, currents, and tides, has, even in old-fashioned text books, always been treated in an explanatory manner, as if it were a rational and not an empirical subject. I desire, as has been already said, to extend this manner of treatment as systematically to the forms of the land as to the phenomena of the sea; and when thus fortified, physiography will not remain in the discredited position that it occupies to-day.

The atmosphere having been set aside under a special heading, and the ocean being properly regarded as a minor subdivision of the subject as a whole—however large and delightful a subject the ocean is to those who study it simply with respect to itself,—a considerable share of a half-year course may be devoted to the study of the lands. Inasmuch as a large part of all preliminary geographical teaching has been devoted to the lands, the scholar should enter their further study well prepared for rapid advance through their many interesting and

important phases. The subject thus becomes so rich that I can only indicate its quality, and not its contents.

The first requisite of good physiographic work is to recognize that the forms of the land which we see have come to be what they are entirely through natural processes; and these processes are chiefly of two kinds, the one elevatory or constructional, as I like to call it; the other degradational, or destructional. Every square mile or square foot of land surface stands somewhere in a cycle of change that has had a constructional beginning, and that is advancing towards its destructional end. It follows, therefore, that every kind of land surface should be regarded in a sympathetic manner in order to perceive its place in its long cycle of life. We should look at rivers as rivers look at each other; we should talk of mountains as they speak to one another. Along with the intimacy of acquaintance thus cultivated, there comes a natural expansion of the terminology by which our conceptions of the subject are verbalized; and in this way, physiography emerges from the childish stage in which it would otherwise remain, when its various features are named only with such terms as we learned in early schooling. Throughout the study there is most excellent exercise of the imagination; for the mind has to picture the changes through which any given area has already passed, and is yet to pass, in order to see more clearly the form that it now possesses. There is need of a considerable continuity of thought, for the more serious consideration of the subject requires a deliberate discussion of a long series of changes in the process of land development. Many side issues turn off here and there from the main line of thought, involving much care to keep them clearly independent. There can surely be no lack of mental discipline in a study that is so far removed from an empirical method of presentation. Indeed, as I have already said, those who are familiar with the modern development of physiography have no hesitation in according it a high rank among school studies, or in asking for it the

accredit that will come when it is placed on equal footing with other studies in the list of college admission examinations, as well as in the high school programme.

Physiography is not only worthy of having a good place among high-school studies and of gaining a place among the subjects for admission examinations ; it is one of those studies whose lessons are recalled with pleasure and profit in after life. Excepting the ocean, with which we have comparatively rare contacts, its other divisions, the atmosphere and the lands, are always with us. To gain an intelligent appreciation of the phenomena of the one and of the forms of the other is like gaining an understanding of an unknown language. An advancing young physiographer once said to me, after a visit to Niagara : "The region there seemed to be a great book, in which most of the visitors could understand only the pictures, but in which a knowledge of the development of land forms enabled me to read the text." Furthermore, it is through physiography that most of our people must gain their only introduction to the teachings of geology. Geology proper is not a good high school subject ; many of its chapters involve more preparatory training than can be had short of a college class. Yet it would be unfortunate if the intelligent youth of the country had no opportunity of gaining at least a general view of the simpler geological principles ; and for this reason alone it might be argued that some ideas of constructional and destructional processes, of the long lapse of time indicated by the structure and sculpture of the land, should be advisedly introduced in physiography.

Let me finally, before closing, consider briefly some of the advantageous reactions that would follow indirectly from the acceptance of examinations in physiography by our colleges and scientific schools. Understanding at the outset that the examinations should be serious affairs, the first beneficial result that they will secure will be the employment of well-trained teachers to take charge of the subject in the schools. There is no sufficient reason why the school teachers of physiography should

not be as well prepared for their work as the school-teachers of Latin, mathematics, or physics are for theirs. Certainly, the examination papers for admission to college should be effectual barriers against scholars who had not been well taught by well-trained instructors. In the second place, the standard of expectation in physiography thus set for scholars who wish to enter college will be accepted as the standard for those who do not go to college; and in this way a large number of young people will be raised to a higher educational level than they now reach. In the third place, the graduates of the high schools who go to teach in the grammar schools, as so many do, will have a better preparation than they can now secure for their work in a much neglected subject; namely, elementary geography. While I recognize warmly and fully the conscientious efforts of the teachers of to-day, it is mortifying and even disheartening to discover their ignorance of so fundamental a subject as geography. Little wonder that it has come to be a discredited subject in our lower schools, and that much talk is made now-a-days of the need of its improvement. There is no single step that will do so much to raise the standard of the grammar-school teaching of geography as the establishment of a respectable standard for physiography in the high school. In the fourth place, physiography is now commonly regarded as a subject only good enough to study in the schools, but not good enough to be accepted as a measure of preparation for college. When this stigma is removed, the study will gain much in prestige, not only among college students, but perhaps even in college faculties; and instead of turning over the college course in physiography to some one, a historian, a geologist, or whoever is willing to take it, special preparation and real proficiency may be expected of the professor in charge of it. What results may in the future follow this change from the customs of to-day might be taken as the ground for interesting speculation, but not for anything more at present, because in this country at least we have yet to reach the general recognition of physi-

ography and advanced geography as worthy college subjects, demanding a man's whole time, as much as physics or economics.

It is therefore not too much to claim that in physiography, as in any other study, a favorable effect will follow all along the educational line when it is recognized as worthy of a place among college admission examinations. In its modern development, it fully deserves such a place ; and I look to this Association as one of the bodies by which physiography shall be helped to secure its deserts.

Immediately after the address the seats were removed, refreshments were served by the University, and a most enjoyable hour was spent in social intercourse. The Committee of arrangements for this social gathering were Professor Winslow Upton, Professor Albert D. Palmer, Dr. George A. Williams, and Dr. William T. Peck.

SATURDAY MORNING

The Association was called to order by President Seelye at 9:25.

The Secretary, for the Executive Committee, reported a list of forty-six persons who were nominated for membership. These were unanimously elected. Their names are here given ;

Harlan P. Amen, Principal of Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H. ; Walter E. Andrews, Teacher in English High School, Worcester ; Fred W. Atkinson, Principal of High School, Springfield ; Florence Bigelow, Principal of Walnut Hill Preparatory School, Natick, Mass. ; Max F. Blau, Teacher in Thayer Academy, South Braintree ; William L. Burdick, Teacher in Hotchkiss School, Lakeville ; Wilson R. Butler, Principal of High School, Waltham, Mass. ; Edward Channing, Professor in Harvard University, Cambridge ; George C. Chase, President of Bates College, Lewiston, Me. ; Charlotte H. Conant, Principal of Walnut Hill Preparatory School, Natick, Mass. ; Caroline J. Cook, Teacher in Dana Hall, Wellesley ; C. F. A. Currier, Professor in Massachusetts Institute Technology, Boston ; Davis R. Dewey, Professor in Massachusetts Institute Technology, Boston ;

John Edward Dinsmore, Principal of Lincoln Academy, Newcastle, Me.; Herbert D. Foster, Professor in Dartmouth College, Hanover N. H.; Clarence W. Gleason, Teacher in Roxbury Latin School, Roxbury; E. R. Goodwin, Principal of Classical High School, Worcester; Mary E. Gorham, Secretary of the Board of Examiners, Wellesley College, Wellesley; Charles Gross, Professor in Harvard University, Cambridge; Elizabeth D. Hanscom, Teacher in Smith College, Northampton; Sophie Chantal Hart, Instructor in Wellesley College, Wellesley; Oscar Hawes, Teacher in Private School, Billerica; Archibald L. Hodges, Teacher in Classical High School, Worcester; Arthur Gordner Leacock, Teacher in Wesleyan Academy, Wilbraham; Leo R. Lewis, Professor in Tufts College; Charles J. Lincoln, Head Master of Dorchester High School, Dorchester; B. W. McFarland, Teacher in Hillhouse High School, New Haven; M. M. Marble, Teacher in Hillhouse High School, New Haven; T. C. Mendenhall, President of Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester; Charles S. Moore, Principal of High School, New Bedford; Charles S. Murkland, President of N. H. College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Durham, N. H.; A. Eugene Nolen, Teacher in High School, Fitchburg; L. Herbert Owen, Master of High School, Woburn; Mary N. Parsons, Teacher in Pinkerton Academy, Derry, N. H.; Irene Saniewska, Principal of School for Girls, Providence; Charles E. Sargent, Teacher in Hillhouse High School, New Haven; Hugo K. Schilling, Professor in Harvard University, Cambridge; William T. Sedgwick, Professor in Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston; Herbert A. Smith, Instructor in Yale University, New Haven; Charles W. Stone, Teacher of Private School, Boston; William G. Thayer, Head Master of St. Mark's School, Southborough; Abbie A. Tilton, Teacher in School for Girls, Providence; W. A. Towne, Principal of Bulkeley School, New London, Ct.; Charles St. Clair Wade, Professor in Tufts College; Emily C. Weeks, Principal of Private School, Boston; Mary E. Whipple, Teacher in English High School, Worcester.

Dr. Ray Greene Huling presented the Secretary's report, showing that the members of the Association now numbered 281. Of these 125 were from the colleges and 156 from the secondary schools. Of the latter 69 were from public high

schools, and 87 from private and endowed secondary schools.

The same gentleman, as Treasurer, presented the following statement :

RECEIPTS.

Balance, Oct. 13, 1894,	\$238 46
Received from assessments:	
1892-3, (1)	1 50
1893-4, (6)	9 00
1894-5, (203)	304 50
1895-6, (1)	1 50
	<hr/> 316 50
Received from sale of proceedings,	3 00
	<hr/> \$557 96

EXPENDITURES.

Paid for printing,	\$146 00
" for postage and stationery,	97 31
" caterer,	87 50
" stenographer, typewriter, and janitor,	43 62
" freight, expressage, and telegrams.	13 38
" expenses of delegate,	11 25
	<hr/> 399 06
Balance, Oct. 10, 1895,	\$158 90

These reports were accepted and placed on file.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : We will pass to the next business in order, namely, the report of the delegates to the Conference on English requirements of May 9th and 10th, 1895. Are those delegates ready to report ? Dr. Tetlow, Miss Jordan, and Dr. Hill, I believe, were the delegates.

DR. TETLOW : I have here the official minutes of the Conference ; but I will present as the report of the delegates sent by this Association to the Conference, only so much of the official minutes as is of general interest. It is as follows :

The Joint Conference on English Requirements for Admission to College, consisting of three delegates from the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, three from the Commission of Colleges in New England, three from the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, and one delegate from the Conference of Teachers of English of the North Central States, met at the College of Liberal Arts of Boston University at 3:30 o'clock p. m., May 9, 1895.

All the delegates were in attendance as follows: Miss Mary A. Jordan and Messrs. L. B. R. Briggs, George R. Carpenter, Albert S. Cook, Wilson Farrand, F. A. Hill, Fred N. Scott, Francis H. Stoddard, John Tetlow, and C. T. Winchester.

A preliminary discussion of the principles to be followed in the preparation of the lists of books to be prescribed for admission to college resulted in the passage of the following votes:

I. That lists be made for two years only, viz., 1899 and 1900.

[As the whole subject of English instruction and English requirements was considered to be still in the experimental stage, it was not deemed advisable for lists of books to be prescribed too far in advance.]

II. That four books be prescribed for study.

III. That not more than one of the works prescribed for study be changed in any one year.

IV. That the substantial content of the books prescribed for reading and practice do not exceed three times that of the books prescribed for study.

V. That not more than two of the works prescribed for reading and practice be changed in any one year.

The lists for 1899 and 1900, as determined by votes subsequently taken, were approved as follows:

FOR READING AND PRACTICE

1899: Dryden's *Palamon and Arcite*; Pope's *Iliad*, Books I., VI., XXII., and XXIV.; The Sir Roger de Coverley Papers in the *Spectator*; Goldsmith's *The Vicar of Wakefield*; Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*; De Quincey's *Flight of a Tartar Tribe*; Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans*; Lowell's *Vision of Sir Launfal*; Hawthorne's *The House of the Seven Gables*.

1900: Dryden's *Palamon and Arcite*; Pope's *Iliad*, Books I., VI., XXII., and XXIV.; The Sir Roger de Coverley Papers in the *Spectator*; Goldsmith's *The Vicar of Wakefield*; Scott's *Ivanhoe*; DeQuincey's *Flight of a Tartar Tribe*; Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans*; Tennyson's *The Princess*; Lowell's *The Vision of Sir Launfal*.

FOR STUDY

1899: Shakespeare's *Macbeth*; Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Books I. and II.; Burke's *Speech on Conciliation with America*; Carlyle's *Essay on Burns*.

1900: Shakespeare's *Macbeth*; Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Books I. and II.; Burke's *Speech on Conciliation with America*; Macaulay's *Essays on Milton and Addison*.

DR. TETLOW: I would suggest that so much of the report of the delegates to the Conference be accepted and placed on file. The following additional vote was passed:

That the Conference recommends that the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations, the New England Association of Col-

leges and Preparatory Schools, the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, and the Conference of Teachers of English of the North Central States each appoint a committee of conference to prepare in joint session lists of books for entrance examinations in English subsequent to the year 1900, to consider such other business as may properly come before the Joint Conference, and to report the conclusions reached to the bodies named above.

I suggest that so much of the report as is embodied in the vote just read be referred to the Executive Committee with full power.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : You hear the report and the suggestion made by the Chairman of the delegates to that Conference. Is it your pleasure to accept the suggestion which was made, that the report, in reference to the requirements in English be accepted and placed on file ?

MR. FOX :—I dislike to take up the time of the Association so much, but there are one or two points in this report upon which I wish there might be an interchange of opinion. I sympathize very strongly with the review of a book of College requirements in English written by Professor Brander Matthews, and published in the *Educational Review* for April, 1895. It voiced certain sentiments, which I have always felt, but, as I was not strictly a teacher of English, I was somewhat loth to express them before this Association.

With most of the resolutions presented by Mr. Tetlow, I heartily agree, especially the one recommending that there should be a slight change from year to year. I was disposed to criticise at length the list of books as now given, since my teacher of English, who is a very faithful, earnest and successful one, claims that there is too much to do in this list, if the work is to be done thoroughly. I may say that I feel but little sympathy with anything that would tend to make this work a superficial study, and I would much prefer to have the number of books given lessened somewhat.

The criticism of Professor Matthews, if I remember right, was upon the wisdom of putting the poems of Milton in the secondary school programme. I know that he was strongly oppose to the minor poems of Milton, and if I remember rightly his opposition also included *Paradise Lost*. I should like to have an expression of opinion upon this point from teachers

of English who have taught Milton in secondary schools, especially in a class two years before going to college, because, in the natural trend of things, these books for rapid reading would be taken first. The scholars at that period of their course are not yet mature enough to appreciate Milton, and I am certain they are not prepared to take up the minor poems of Milton with anything like success. I simply express my opinion about including Milton in the programme of requirements in English, because I think something more fitting for boys can be found.

Second, I should not, also, be very strongly in favor either of Dryden or Pope. I should be glad to limit the list of requirements to Shakespeare and the Nineteenth Century. As to the character of the literature recommended, it seems to me that the books in English preparation for college should largely be of the dramatic, and also narrative kind. I am extremely doubtful about including works in didactic poetry or the poetry of reflection. I should be rather opposed to including critical works in the list. The danger sometimes is that the English professors are specially fond of some particular field of literature, and so disposed to set it for the boys who are preparing for college. It seems to me often that the secondary school boy is not ready for such books, and cannot take them successfully, and that nobody is a better judge of that than the secondary school teacher. I should be very sparing in taking up critical works in the requirements of English.

There are two possible purposes in regard to English requirements. One is to awaken the interest of pupils in the best literature. It should be taught so that the scholar will be disposed to cultivate it of his own accord in after life. I know a very distinguished English professor who objects to the requirements from Milton, from the fact that it actually causes among the boys a prejudice against Milton, when they take it up before they are ready. I am talking of the average boy, not the bright boy.

The other purpose is to have the pupil obtain in studying this list of books a chronological view of English literature, which, in the opinion of some, should be the predominating purpose. When I asked one of the members of the Commission why a certain list of books was published, containing one or two that seemed to me uninteresting, like Defoe's *History of the Plague in London*, he said that the list was framed to

give a chronological outline of English literature ; as I understood him, that was to be the predominating purpose. To teach an historical view of English Literature, I should not make the predominating purpose in forming these lists. I wish that we could have some expression of individual opinion on this subject. As for myself, I repeat that I would sweep everything away except Shakespeare and the literature of the Nineteenth Century, and I do not believe that then the heavens would fall.

DR. TETLOW : I am very glad that Mr. Fox has given expression to his views. It will be useful for those who are hereafter to be delegates from this Association to the Conference on English requirements to know what his views and the views of those who sympathize with him are. I do not think, however, that what has been said ought to be considered to have a bearing on the question of accepting this report. The recommendations of the Conference have been received by the Commission of Colleges for New England, and have been acted upon by that body ; and the results of the deliberations of the Commission have been sent to the colleges. I suppose, therefore, that what is presented in the report this morning has passed the stage of discussion. The lists of books that were prepared last year will probably be accepted by the colleges, and many schools have doubtless been looking forward to those lists as a finality.

I should like to say a word about Milton. In the third and fourth years of the Girls' High School course of study, Milton's *Paradise Lost* has had a prominent place for ten or twelve years, and I have seen no reason for asking to have it removed. No teacher of English has ever asked to have it removed. Mr. Fox says that of the two purposes which may be served by a list of books prescribed for reading and study, namely, the awakening of interest in the pupil, and the suggestion of a chronological survey of English literature, he should prefer the former. I should prefer both. The Committee of Ten, or rather the English Conference, which reported to the Committee of Ten, you will remember, recommended that the books selected for the preparatory school course of study should be such as to make it possible for the teacher of English to combine with the reading and study of the books a general survey of English literature from the Elizabethan age to the present time. It seems to me that this is a very desirable thing to accomplish.

MR. GROCE : I understood you to say the literature from the period of Elizabeth ; did you mean literature, or the history of literature ?

DR. TETLOW : I meant that it should be possible for the teacher of English to give his class, not in detail, but in a systematic way, a general survey of the development of literature from the time of Elizabeth to the present time ; and that, to this end, significant and representative works, chosen from the entire period, should make the content of the requirement for admission to college in English. Mr. Fox made some objection to Dryden. I should also make objection to some parts of Dryden ; but the *Palamon and Arcite* is a work well adapted to interest young people. It seems to me, we want to combine these two objects—the awakening of the pupil's interest and, with it, an intelligent appreciation of the historical progress of English Literature.

MR. FOX : I hope Mr. Tetlow understood that I had no intention, by my remarks, of delaying any action. I understand the necessity of accepting that programme, but I think, if we are to affect future action, an expression of opinion is desirable for the benefit of the Commission. Though some of us do not approve of all the books, we will accept them, but I feel like saying with regard to certain books, as the absent-minded tutor said to the Freshman who came and asked leave of absence on account of the death of his grandfather, "I hope that it will not happen again."

DR. TETLOW : I agree with Mr. Fox that it is very desirable that there should be a free and full expression of opinion.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : Is there anything more to be said in reference to this suggestion that the part of the report relating to requirements for admission in English, be accepted and placed on file ? Are you ready to vote on that suggestion ? Those in favor of accepting the report manifest it.

The motion was declared carried.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : The recommendation was also made in regard to the delegates to the next Conference, that the ap-

pointment of delegates be referred to the Executive Committee, with full power to make such appointments. Is there anything to be said in reference to that recommendation ?

DR. TETLOW : My suggestion was that the resolution as a whole, including its recommendations, be referred to the Executive Committee with full power.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : Will Dr. Huling be kind enough to read that resolution, so that the members of the Association may understand it ?

DR. HULING : "The Conference recommends that the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations, the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, and the Conference of Teachers of English in the North Central States, each appoint a Committee of Conference to prepare in Joint Session a list of books for entrance examinations in English subsequent to the year 1900 ; and to consider such other business as may properly come before the Joint Conference, and to report the conclusions reached to the bodies named above."

PRESIDENT SEELYE : Is it your pleasure to refer the resolution just read to the Executive Committee ?

The resolution was so referred.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : The next business in order will be the report of the Nominating Committee and the election of officers. Professor Poland is chairman of that Committee.

PROFESSOR POLAND : The Committee met last evening and made the following nominations : For President, Dr. L. Clark Seelye ; Vice Presidents, Dr. C. F. P. Bancroft and President Charles W. Eliot ; Secretary and Treasurer, Dr. Ray Greene Huling ; Executive Committee, (with the preceding) Dr. Horace M. Willard, President Elmer H. Capen, President William DeWitt Hyde, Mr. Edward G. Coy, Professor Frances E. Lord ; Member of the Committee of Conference, whose term expires in 1898, Mr. Arthur L. Goodrich.

DR. TETLOW : I move that the Secretary be authorized to cast a ballot in behalf of the Association for the election of the gentlemen whose names have been mentioned.

The motion was adopted.

DR. HULING : I take pleasure in presenting this ballot of the Association for the officers for the ensuing year.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : The officers nominated are the officers elected for the ensuing year. The next business will be the report of the Committee to confer with the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations; is that Committee ready to report?

DR. WILLIAM T. PECK : (Reads the report as follows.)

The Committee to confer with the Commission of Colleges in New England, present the following report :

On the 10th of May, 1895, the Committee appeared before the Commission of Colleges in New England and laid before it the resolutions adopted at the Ninth Annual Meeting in October, 1894, and at the Special Meeting in December. They have received from the Secretary of the Commission, Prof. William Carey Poland, the following reply to their communication :—

9 LLOYD STREET,
PROVIDENCE, R. I.,
9 October, 1895.)

MESSRS. W. T. PECK, C. E. FISH, AND W. GALLAGHER,
Committee of the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools appointed to confer with the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations.

DEAR SIRS :—At the last annual meeting of the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations, held in Boston on the 10th day of last May, you appeared before the Commission and presented a communication which the Commission considered with great interest and care. It finally passed two votes in reply to the communication. Inasmuch as the report of the meeting was printed last May in the ninth annual report of the Commission, I beg you to allow me to send you with this letter a copy of that report instead of repeating here the account therein given of your communication and of our action in response to it. This account is printed on pages 17 to 20 of the report. It is perhaps unnecessary to add anything to what is there reported; but I may be permitted to say that the Commission always desires to find itself able to agree with the wishes of your Association.

Your Association doubtless will be interested to learn from the ninth annual report what action the Commission has taken on the subjects of Requirements in Latin and in Greek, of Requirements in English, and of Requirements in French and in German.

With sincere regard for yourselves personally, and for the Association which you represent,

I have the honor to remain, dear sirs,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM CAREY POLAND,
Secretary of the Commission.

By reference to the ninth annual report of the Commission it is noted that, in response to the resolution in regard to the advisability of the division of the examination in English, the Commission voted:

That it is the sense of the Commission that it is not expedient at this time to make any recommendation as to the advisability of the division of the examination in English into a preliminary and a final examination.

In response to the resolutions upon the closer articulation between the secondary schools and the higher institutions of New England, the most important of which resolutions was: That, as an effective means of securing such closer articulation, the satisfactory completion of any one of the studies embodied in the programmes submitted on pages 46 and 47 of the Report of the Committee of Ten, to the extent and in the manner recommended by the committee, should be allowed to count for admission to colleges and scientific schools; the Commission passed the following vote:

That in the sense of the Commission the action requested by the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools is inexpedient, inasmuch as it involves important changes in the college courses.

In regard to the other subjects mentioned in the letter of Prof. Poland, the action of the Commission is brought before the Association in other ways to-day, both in regard to the subject of Requirements in Latin and Greek, and to the subject of Requirements in English, but in regard to the Requirements in French and in German, it is noted that the Commission appointed a committee of five to take into consideration the desirability of changes in the requirements in French and in German, and to propose to the Commission such changes as it may find desirable.

Your Committee was invited by special invitation to be present at a conference of the Professors in Latin and Greek of the New England Colleges upon the 9th of May, and to take part in the discussion.

At the last annual meeting the Committee of Conference was authorized to consider itself a medium of communication between this Association and the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland. No business was voted by this Association, and upon communication with a similar Committee of the other Association it was found that no duty was assigned them for this year.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM T. PECK,	} <i>Committee.</i>
CHARLES E. FISH,	
WILLIAM GALLAGHER,	

October 12th, 1895.

PRESIDENT SEELYE: You hear the report of this Committee, what action will you take in reference to it?

DR. TETLOW: I move that it be accepted and placed on file.

The motion was adopted.

MR. JAMES JENKINS, of the Worcester English High School :
Might I bring forward a matter of business at this time ?

PRESIDENT SEELYE : There is an opportunity for bringing forward any legitimate business, at the present time.

MR. JENKINS : It seems to me that the action of the Association, yesterday, placed it before the Association of Colleges as asking for an addition to the present requirements, while it would be manifestly impossible, in the present over-crowded condition of secondary courses, to add new subjects. In thinking the matter over, I thought of presenting these resolutions, that the colleges be requested to include in the list of subjects which may be offered for admission, Physics, Chemistry, Biology—by that meaning Physiology, Botany, and Zoölogy—and Physiography—including in that term, Physical Geography, Mineralogy, and Geology—which subjects are now taught in many high schools ; that in every subject there should be an elementary and advanced requirement ; that elementary English and Elementary Mathematics, together with either one ancient or one modern language as an advanced subject, be required of all ; that out of the total number of subjects named by the colleges for admission, individual pupils be required to present themselves in a limited number of elementary, and not more than three advanced subjects ; that, for the A. B. degree, at least two languages, other than the English, be required.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : You hear the resolution as proposed by Mr. Jenkins, of the Worcester English High School ; is there anything to be said in reference to these resolutions ?

DR. TETLOW : It seems to me, Mr. President, that so important a matter ought not to be disposed of in the time that is left us for the consideration of it ; also that important propositions presented for adoption should be supported by argument before we are called upon formally to accept them. I would suggest, therefore, if it is acceptable to the mover of these resolutions, that they be referred to the Executive Committee for such action as that Committee may deem proper. If the Executive Committee should think it best, the substance of the resolutions might be put into the form of a question to be assigned for discussion a year hence. I do not feel, for

one, prepared to vote this morning on so important a matter. Before the question of reference to the Executive Committee is decided, however, I should be very glad if the mover of the resolutions would explain them a little more fully, and give us his reasons for presenting them.

MR. JENKINS: Precisely such action is what I expected and hoped might take place. This morning I had an opportunity to speak to two or three members of the Association before coming in, on this subject, and I hope that some such action as that suggested by Mr. Tetlow will be taken. The object of these resolutions is to encourage and make it possible for pupils in the English high schools to attend college. The intention is not in any way to hamper the country high school, or any other secondary school, in preparing boys for college. I think these resolutions should be considered by some Committee, and discussed at some future meeting.

PRESIDENT SEELYE: Will Mr. Jenkins be kind enough to read those resolutions?

MR. JENKINS:

Resolved, I. That the Colleges be requested to include in the list of subjects which may be offered for admission, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, and Physiography, which subjects are now taught in many high schools.

II. That, in every subject, there be an elementary and an advanced requirement.

III. That elementary English and elementary mathematics, together with either one ancient or one modern language (other than English) as an advanced subject, be required of all.

IV. That out of the total number of subjects named by the colleges for admission, the individual pupil be required to present himself in a limited number of elementary and not more than three advanced subjects.

V. That for the A. B. degree at least two languages other than English be required.

PROFESSOR CHARLES E. FAY, of Tufts College: It seems to me obvious that there has been presented here the next "burning question." We learn from the report just read that in one form the question has already been before the Commission of Colleges, and has not met with favor. The Commission has found it inexpedient to adopt the resolution very hastily passed by this Association last December. This resolution, you will

remember, was the hasty substitute for one carefully prepared, which we discussed up to the very point of passing, and which had won the assent of some persons who did not see how it could be practically carried out. By reason however, of a very just protest, these combined forces were disordered, and the Association accepted a suggestion made on the spur of the moment, and adopted it with wonderful unanimity under the circumstances. I am a little surprised to see in the report of the Committee on History that this action is referred to as "deliberate." It was anything but deliberate. The question, however, has got to be met, whether or not the colleges are ready to abandon the old method of requiring preparation on one or two set courses for admission to the A. B. course in college, whether a certain degree of latitude, perhaps a large degree, shall become the method of the future. Therefore, while personally by no means convinced that it is a practicable method for a large number of our colleges, I, for one, hope that these resolutions will be referred to the Executive Committee, and that they will find it expedient to present this very important subject for early discussion in a convention of this Association.

MR. COY : I think it is inexpedient to act upon them now, but they can be introduced for discussion at the next annual meeting. I move that they be referred to the Executive Committee

DR. TETLOW : Professor Fay has anticipated what I was about to say. I am very glad, too, to hear Mr. Jenkins' explanation of his purpose in introducing the resolutions. I was myself, when I came to reflect, very much dissatisfied with the outcome of our last December's discussion. I felt that it had resulted in nothing but the postponement of the question that had been presented, and that is pressing for a solution. I hope the time is coming, and coming speedily, when the connection between the English high schools and the colleges will be a more intimate one, and a more sympathetic one, than it is at present. These resolutions perhaps prepare the way for such a connection. The Executive Committee can take them ; and, combining them with suggestions from other sources, embody them in a question for future discussion. I move that the resolutions presented by Mr. Jenkins be referred to the Executive Committee.

PRESIDENT SEELYE: That motion has been made by Mr. Coy.

MR. JENKINS: I went away from the meeting last December dissatisfied and disappointed with the result, and casting about, in my mind, for some way to precipitate the discussion again, and if possible, in a form which might lead to compromise on both sides. I should not expect to have these resolutions pass as they now read, but to have them submitted in a modified form to the colleges for their consideration.

PRESIDENT SEELYE: It is moved that the resolutions be referred to the Executive Committee, and, if in their judgment it is expedient, that the subject be presented to the Association for discussion at the next annual meeting. Are you ready for the question?

The motion to refer was adopted.

MR. FOX: I would move that we take a recess for ten minutes.

The motion was adopted, and a recess from 10:15 to 10:25 was taken.

At 10:25 o'clock the meeting was called to order.

PRESIDENT SEELYE: I understand that Dr. Tetlow would like to bring up one matter of business before proceeding with the discussion.

DR. TETLOW: I desire to move that the thanks of the Association be voted to the authorities of Brown University for the very satisfactory provision they have made for these meetings, and for the hospitality and courtesy which they have extended to the members.

The motion was seconded by Dr. Huling, and being put to the meeting, was carried unanimously.

REQUIREMENTS AND PREPARATORY COURSES IN LATIN AND
GREEK

The discussion was based upon the following propositions :

PROPOSED STATEMENT OF REQUIREMENTS*

LATIN

I Elementary

The Elementary Examination will be adapted to the proficiency of those who have studied Latin in a systematic course of five lessons a week, extending through at least *three* school years. It will consist of two parts (which, however, cannot be taken separately) :—

(a) The translation at sight of simple Latin prose and verse ;

(b) A thorough examination on a prescribed portion of Cicero's speeches (about 30 pages, Teubner text), directed to testing the candidate's mastery of the ordinary forms, constructions, and idioms of the language ; the test to consist, in part, of writing simple Latin prose, involving the use of such words, constructions, and idioms only, as occur in the speeches prescribed.

II Advanced

The Advanced Examinations will be adapted to the proficiency of those who have studied Latin in a systematic course of five lessons a week, extending through at least *four* school years. The two examinations may be taken separately :—

1 The translation at sight of passages of Latin prose and verse, with questions on ordinary forms, constructions and idioms, and on prosody.

2 The translation into Latin prose of a passage of connected English narrative. The passage set for translation will be based on some portion of the Latin prose works usually read in preparation for college, and will be limited to the subject-matter of those works.

GREEK

I Elementary

The Elementary Examinations will be adapted to the proficiency of those who, in addition to the course defined as suitable preparation for the Elementary Examination in Latin, have studied Greek in a systematic course of five exercises a week, extending through at least *two* school years. It will consist of two parts (which, however, cannot be taken separately) :—

(a) The translation at sight of passages of simple Attic prose.

(b) A thorough examination on a prescribed portion of Xenophon (about thirty pages, Teubner text), directed to testing the candidate's mastery of the ordinary forms, constructions, and idioms of the language ; the test to consist, in part, of writing simple Attic prose, involving the use of such words, constructions, and idioms only, as occur in the portion of Xenophon prescribed.

* See Ninth Annual Report of the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations, pp. 7-14.

II Advanced

The Advanced Examinations will be adapted to the proficiency of those who, in addition to the course defined as a suitable preparation for the Advanced Examinations in Latin, have studied Greek in a systematic course of five exercises a week, extending through at least *three* school years. The two examinations may be taken separately:—

1 The translation at sight of passages of Attic prose and of Homer; with questions on ordinary forms, constructions, and idioms, and on prosody.

2 The translation into Attic prose of a passage of connected English narrative. The passage set for translation will be based on some portion of the Greek prose works usually read in preparation for college, and will be limited to the subject-matter of those works.

The portions of Cicero and Xenophon prescribed for the Elementary Examinations will be changed from time to time, notice of change being given at least two years in advance.

PROPOSED PREPARATORY COURSE IN LATIN

FIRST YEAR—Five lessons a week.

First and Second Terms: Introductory Lessons.

Third Term: Easy reading (Fables, Viri Romae, Eutropius, etc.) Practice in reading at sight* and in writing Latin. Systematic study of grammar begun.

SECOND YEAR—Five lessons a week.

First Term: Easy reading continued. Nepos.

Second Term: Caesar (Gallic War, 2 books).

Third Term: Ovid (Metamorphoses, 800–1000 lines).

Practice in reading at sight and in writing Latin, with systematic study of grammar, throughout the year.

THIRD YEAR—Five lessons a week.

First Term: Vergil (*Æneid* 1). Cicero (speeches begun), or Sallust (Selections from the *Catiline*). Practice in reading at sight and in writing Latin. Grammar.

Second and Third Terms: Cicero (speeches continued). Caesar, Ovid, etc., (mainly for practice in reading at sight). Thorough study of text prescribed for the examination (about thirty pages of Cicero, Teubner text), with practice in writing Latin based upon it. Grammar.

FOURTH YEAR—Five lessons a week.

Cicero, Vergil. Selections from other prose and verse. Practice in reading at sight and in writing Latin. Grammar.

* "Reading at sight" is used in these programmes as a convenient phrase to denote the reading of Latin or Greek, with understanding of the sense, independently of or preliminary to the formal rendering into idiomatic English; and by "practice in reading at sight" is meant not merely the translation of unprepared passages in class, but the inculcation of correct methods of reading, to be used by the pupil in preparing assigned passages as well.

If the advanced examination in Latin Composition is not required, the course may be reduced by one lesson a week in the third and fourth years.

PROPOSED PREPARATORY COURSE IN GREEK

FIRST YEAR—Five lessons a week.

First and Second Terms: Introductory Lessons.

Third Term: Anabasis (begun). Practice in reading at sight and in writing Greek. Systematic study of grammar begun.

SECOND YEAR—Five lessons a week.

Anabasis (continued), either alone or with other Attic prose. Practice in reading at sight. Systematic study of grammar. Thorough study of text prescribed for the examination (about thirty pages of Xenophon, Teubner text), with practice in writing Greek based upon it.

THIRD YEAR—Five lessons a week.

Homer (three-fourths of the time). Attic prose, with practice in writing Greek (one-fourth). Grammar. Practice in reading at sight.

If the advanced examination in Greek Composition is not required, the course may be reduced by one lesson a week in the last year.

PRESIDENT SEELYE: The subject for discussion this morning is "The Statement of Requirements and the Preparatory Courses in Latin and in Greek proposed by the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations." Mr. Charles C. Ramsay, Principal of the B. M. C. Durfee High School, Fall River, will open the discussion.

MR. RAMSAY: In an exigency—though common, but no less unfortunate—of selecting the speakers for this meeting, I was asked not many days ago to address you on the topic assigned me for this occasion. By the terms of the invitation, which expressed a desire to hear the opinion of a headmaster of a large secondary school upon this subject, I felt less reluctant than otherwise to accept at a late moment the responsibility of speaking to you. I feel, therefore, that—though I am not just now teaching Latin and Greek—perhaps, as coming from one who will maintain to some extent the executive point of view in the treatment of the theme under consideration, my

remarks may not be wholly devoid of interest to at least some of those present.

Latin and Greek—with mathematics—long held the chief place of honor in the curricula of secondary schools and colleges. For this reason it would be natural to expect excellent results of instruction in these important branches of a liberal education; and, as a matter of fact, in all discussion of educational values, either recent or remote in time, much has been claimed by their friends and much conceded by others respecting their high value as instruments of discipline and culture. If the traditions of centuries of experience in their study and in their teaching count for anything, we may indeed admit at once all that has been claimed for them in these respects. It is certainly true that, as taught in the best schools and colleges, they develop a much higher degree of intellectual power and furnish a much wider range of mental culture than it is possible yet to secure from the present methods of instruction in some other branches that might be named in school and college curricula.

In the schools this is due, however, not so much to the quality of the teaching as to the excellence of the classical text books now generally in use, which the scholarship and experience of generations of devoted students of the ancient classics have at last succeeded in producing. To the best instructors in schools and colleges, who have for years or perhaps all their lives enjoyed the advantages of thorough and effective teaching, it would doubtless be very surprising to learn how much inferior instruction in Latin and Greek is yet to be found in the secondary schools. To those who are seeking to keep abreast of the improvements in teaching constantly, I think, being made, it may seem incredible that so many classical teachers are still imitating not the points of excellence but of weakness in the way they were taught in the olden days. In the face of the best modern theory and practice, the visitor to schools may yet find instructors in Latin and Greek treating the noblest pieces of literature as mere illustrations of grammat-

ical rules and exceptions. It is not an infrequent experience on entering a recitation in these languages to see no sign in picture or other visible illustration of classical themes or incidents, and to feel no atmosphere of a foreign tongue, of another world of thought and speech. How often still one hears no reading aloud by teacher and pupils of the most superb, most sonorous, most expressive speech the world has ever known; but, instead, too frequently he is bored by the old mechanical, stupefying and pernicious process of "over setting" the ancient tongue into—not good, idiomatic but—wretched "translation English." Despite all the recommendations of all the committees of all the associations of all the progressive classical teachers in the country, not many pupils are yet taught by precept and practice the distinction between *understanding* and *translating*, between *feeling* and *expressing* the meaning of a Latin or Greek sentence; not many pupils in secondary schools are yet able even correctly to pronounce the words, and intelligently by modulation and emphasis to indicate the meaning of the simpler Latin or Greek they are studying; not many of them have, by the end of their preparatory course, an appreciation of Latin or Greek word-order; not many have a respectable vocabulary of classical words, one or more meanings of which they really know; not many, by Latin or Greek writing on the basis of selected classical models, have acquired a fair degree of mastery of the elements of syntax; and few, therefore, have any genuine power, by wise instruction and extensive practice in sight-reading over easy Latin or Greek prose.

There are yet too many routine teachers whose old instructors' methods are still "good enough for them." There are still too few classical teachers who have read widely and critically other authors than those prescribed to them in their college—or worse yet, their high-school—days. It is not my purpose, however, to paint a wholly dark picture of the present classical instruction in the schools; for great improvements have been made, long strides have been taken, by many secon-

dary schools and classical teachers. In fact, no department of instruction has shown greater activity, and made more progress through some of its representatives than has that of the ancient classics. Were it not for these earnest and intelligent workers, the classical department had gone down in the fierce competition with the modern studies. But it is always best to face the hard facts of any situation ; such workers are not the majority, nor the excellent results of their instruction common.

We welcome, therefore, any inspiring influences upon secondary school teaching which the best classical teachers can bring to bear upon our work in the secondary schools, or any requirement which they may seek to impose by which the standard of elementary classical instruction may be raised. Such I believe to be the "Statement of the Requirements and the Preparatory Courses in Latin and Greek proposed by the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations."

At this point, however, let me say a few words parenthetically about the relations of the schools and the colleges. The debt of the schools to the colleges is enormous. Not only do the colleges furnish the scholarship of the best secondary teachers and the standards of the schools, but they also stand to the schools, which are often set in the midst of gross, material influences and environment, as beacon lights pointing the way to the higher life. Always the best colleges stand as powerful protests against low, sordid, and selfish aims in individual and communal life. To speak more specifically, I am glad to say that many of them stand as conspicuous examples, to which the secondary teacher may point his pupils, of the salutary effects of the refining and ennobling influences of high moral and social standards ; the practical application, in gentlemanly and manly conduct in daily life, of the higher culture for which all colleges are supposed to stand. In the school-life of his pupils, how often the earnest secondary teacher longs for more of the best influences of college life ; for it is true, I fear, that "a large school is nearly always a hot-house

of mediocrity in scholarship and philistinism in morals.”* The schools need all of the highest and most wholesome influences of the colleges, to enable them to render their truest service to the communities in which they are placed. I often wonder why teachers of secondary schools do not oftener visit college class-rooms for suggestions of method in the treatment of the subjects which they teach in school, and for a draught of the scholarly spirit and devotion to unworldly ideals of life. The work of the freshman year is not so essentially different from school-work as to prove devoid of pedagogic value to them. On the other hand, the colleges are greatly indebted to the schools; but of this, preferring to leave it to college instructors to express, I will not speak, farther than to say that it is to be regretted that there is not a freer, more open passage from school to college teaching, and to remark that in the power and skill of imparting knowledge not a few college instructors have something which they *may* and which they *ought* to learn from some teachers in secondary schools.

Let me return from this digression to the central theme of this paper: the statements of the proposed requirements and courses in Latin and Greek for admission to college. Though I have not been presumptuous enough to search them for pedagogic errors, an ordinary examination has served to prove them pretty free from defects and an excellent composite of the various conflicting views of classical teachers in both schools and colleges. Before speaking specifically of their points of excellence, I will however venture to suggest wherein it seems to me these statements and courses may be of much greater service to the schools:—

1. In my opinion, the time has come when such a report as this may wisely recommend in case of Latin and Greek what ought to be arranged for admission requirements in every subject; let these be fixed, naming the authors to be read and the quantity of work to be done, a maximum beyond or outside of which the strongest colleges might not go in admission ex-

*Mr. Thomas Davidson: *The Forum*, July, 1894, page 577.

aminations ; if weaker colleges wish to make less severe demands, let it be agreed that they may do so only by selecting from this maximum requirement and not impose unique demands in any respect upon the preparatory schools. In other words, I strongly believe in a sliding scale of college admission requirements in all subjects in which examinations are set or certificates are accepted from the principal of a secondary school. This much is certainly due the larger number of secondary schools that find it difficult, under all their limitations, to do well the work regularly imposed upon them by the majority of the colleges for which they prepare candidates for admission.

2. It seems to me that for the greatest service to the schools, that part of the report under the heading "Proposed Statement of Requirements," may wisely be expanded into a monograph of practical suggestions upon the best ways of teaching Latin and Greek in schools, in order to meet the very just demands by the colleges for both *knowledge* and *power* on the part of the candidates for admission. Without here entering upon a discussion of the relative merits of the methods of admission to college, upon certificate or by examination, I may remark in passing, that the time may yet come when all the colleges can safely adopt the former method, if they will unite not only in a uniform sliding scale of entrance requirements, but also in the publication of the various acceptable methods of preparation upon the important topics of each branch. In a vocation from which there is so much shifting to other occupations, and into which enter novices who have had no professional training for their work, an important share of the labor of fitting pupils for college too often falls to fresh recruits with little or no experience in the delicate and difficult art of teaching. Even if school authorities should demand, and the candidates for the position of teachers in the secondary schools should desire, professional preparation, it is well known that adequate provisions for such training do not yet exist in normal schools, colleges, and universities. Young teachers need, and generally would welcome, such directions from college instruc-

tors as I have suggested ; and the fossils still to be found attempting to teach in some high schools and academies need, even if they would not welcome, such assistance.

3. I should have been glad if in the Latin requirements, it had been expressly stated that "portions of Cicero"* might include a choice among his Essays and Letters in addition to certain of his Speeches ; likewise, in the Greek requirements, that "portions of Xenophon"* might include some part of the Hellenica in addition to certain parts of the Anabasis. It might have been well, moreover, to have distinctly stated that some of the narrative portions of Thucydides would be accepted in the requirements in Attic prose.

4. As one who is somewhat familiar with the mental powers of the average high school pupil, I prefer to see the suggestion of a possible examination upon *prescribed* portions of the authors to be read in preparation for college incorporated in the body of the statements rather than in a note† of the votes (No. 2) taken by members of the Commission of Colleges. Even in case of the brighter pupils, it is not always possible in many public high schools—by reason of excessively large classes—to grant every pupil enough time in the recitation hour for adequate practice in "sight reading." Many fairly clever pupils, therefore, never develop sufficient power and facility in translating a classical author to warrant the exclusive reliance, by the college examiners, upon the translation of sight passages in the admission examination. Much faithful work upon the part of such pupils in preparation would count for but little for entrance to college.

5. I should be glad if it had been expressly stated in the proposed requirements that those in Greek, and perhaps in Latin, were merely a maximum requirement ; so that strong candidates from the humbler or weaker schools who come up well prepared on two years' Greek, and possibly on only two years' Latin, but offer a maximum in one or more modern

* Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations. Ninth Annual Report. p. 10

†Ibid, page 13.

studies, might be admitted without conditions. This would, of course, mean that classical instruction in college would have to begin with Homer and Cicero or Vergil. But this is wisely, and I think profitably, done at Harvard; though upon this point Professor Wright, here present, can speak with greater authority than I.

6. Though I know that many teachers will not agree with me, my observation and experience do not sanction the suggestion in the proposed course of study in Latin of beginning Vergil before Cicero. Though it is true that at first the orations are hard enough, yet more pupils appear to have what the Herbartians would call "apperceptive concepts" of the subject-matter of the speeches than poetic taste and appreciation.

7. If the suggestion that, as in former requirements, the questions in the grammar* of the text to be translated in school shall serve to lead teachers to continue the pernicious practice of excessive attention to grammar in the midst of reading or translating in the recitation hour, I should like to see that requirement omitted, and let the examiners depend for their test of the candidates' knowledge of grammar wholly upon their work in Latin and Greek composition; for, after all, this is the true and practical test of such knowledge: the power to use, rather than merely the power to explain the use of, constructions.

8. Perhaps I do not correctly understand the statement that the two parts of the Advanced examination may be taken separately; but if it means that the Advanced examination in either Latin or Greek composition may be taken before the final examinations, I regard it an unwise provision.

9. I wish also that an oral examination had been proposed by the committee for the purpose of testing the candidates' power of reading simple Latin and Greek prose and verse with intelligence and appreciation. In my opinion, though I say it with regret, not many teachers in secondary schools will at-

*Op. cit., pp. 9 and 10, see 1 under "Advanced" in Latin and in Greek.

tend to this important matter until required by the colleges to do so.

I turn now to the much more agreeable duty of noting the points of excellence in the proposed requirements and preparatory courses in Latin and Greek.

1. As was to be expected, the committee has firmly adhered to a requirement of three years' preparation in Greek in the secondary schools. Not only is this eminently right in and for itself, but also susceptible, I think, of adaptation to the purposes of the framers of the classical programme of the Committee of Ten. It seems to me that in that programme the very persons who thought themselves dominated by the desire to grant pupils large liberty of choice have strangely gone to the opposite extreme of *compelling* a youth to postpone, till the end of his second year in the preparatory school, his decision to go to college, a decision which he may be fully ready to make at the end of the first year in school. I would suggest that such pupils be allowed to begin Greek at the beginning of their second year, and let the pupils who decide at the end of their second year to go to college, begin Greek at the beginning of their third year in school. In this way it is clear that one group of candidates would offer three years and the other group two years' Greek for admission to college.

2. I am greatly pleased to observe in the proposed courses of study the displacement of a considerable portion of the old requirement of Caesar by a variety in the first and second year of easier and more interesting Latin. This it seems to me is a great step in advance. If it shall be adopted by the colleges it will work beneficent results to both pupils and teachers. The benefit to teachers I count as of even greater importance than that to pupils. Anything that will broaden, deepen, vitalize, and humanize the teacher's culture, and at the same time do as much for the pupil's mental life, is to be most cordially welcomed. The same is equally true of the suggestion that there may possibly be a greater variety of texts and authors read in Latin and Greek in the third and fourth years of the proposed courses.

3. The omission of an express prescription of the *Bucolics*, which for secondary school pupils have long seemed to me relatively deficient in interest, value, and ease of understanding, I regard a merit of the proposed course in Latin for preparatory schools.

4. The same is true of the omission in the proposed preparatory course in Greek of any suggestion, looking toward the requirement of Herodotus for admission to College. Though the study of Herodotus has not been required by some colleges without reason, yet I think it may be safely said that the disadvantages outweigh the advantages of its prescription in secondary schools. Its omission seems to me in the interests of more thorough teaching of Attic prose, not only by allowing more time for it in the early part of the fourth year, but also by reducing to some extent the distraction of another Greek dialect.

5. The renewed stress laid upon "sight reading" in the statement of requirements and proposed courses is not the least of their merits. As Latin and Greek writing constitutes the best test of grammatical knowledge, so I think the translation of sight passages from the ideal test of the power of understanding, appreciating, and translating the meaning of a classical author. It is an ideal, however, like other ideals as I have intimated before for which we can only strive.

6. I was pleased to observe the absence in the report of any presupposition of Latin instruction below the High School. Although I am heartily in favor of pushing instruction of many high school subjects down into the elementary school, yet I fully agree with my friend Mr. Collar, that Latin should not be placed there before French.

7. The feature of the proposed courses in Latin and Greek which, except one, perhaps, I appreciate most fully—is the maximum number of lessons per week which they prescribe. Though by this I do not mean to say that the Commission on Admission to Colleges in New England is wiser in suggesting five lessons a week for three years, than was the Conference on

Greek of the Committee of Ten in proposing five lessons a week the first year of the study, and four the last two years of the study of Greek ; yet, as the headmaster of a large secondary school, I am very glad that in the proposed preparatory courses submitted by the Commission, five hours is suggested instead of six or seven hours a week in one or more years of the courses in either Latin or Greek. By reason of conservatism and other causes of inertia, as well as from an imperfect perspective in the distribution of time among the various topics in which to prepare pupils for admission to college, and especially by wasteful methods of "sight-reading," some well-meaning teachers think that they must have six or seven hours a week in Latin to prepare a class for the admission examinations or for certification for entrance to college. Though such conscientiousness is much better than its opposite, it not only is destructive of a well-balanced college preparatory course of study, but is also unjust to other teachers and subjects in the school. In my opinion, "sight-reading" books are entirely unnecessary. The best way, and the only admissible way, in a preparatory school is to read at sight in advance of the assigned lesson portions of the prescribed texts, and to assign the parts thus read as a part of the next lesson.

In conclusion, I may say, therefore, that with a few exceptions, I heartily concur in the proposed requirements and courses of study in Latin and Greek, and regard them a distinct advance beyond the work now attempted in these subjects in most schools.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : The discussion will be continued by Professor John K. Lord, of Dartmouth College.

PROFESSOR LORD : I wish so much more to hear what others say than to speak myself that I propose to be very brief, especially as what has been said so nearly, in the main, agrees with my own views.

I should like to say, first, by way of explanation, that, in making the proposed statement of "requirements" in Latin and Greek, the committee which made it did not submit the

proposed "preparatory course" in Latin and Greek with the expectation that it was by any means an ideal course, or that it was the course that would be adopted. Their object was to show that the proposed requirements were feasible, and having made a statement of requirements to prove that they could be carried out. This proposed preparatory course in Latin and Greek was therefore suggested simply with the idea that it would prove that the requirements were not excessive. And, second, we did not wish to be didactic in the matter. We did not indicate in the proposed preparatory course the amounts that were to be read, with one or two exceptions, and those exceptions were suggested to us by teachers whom we consulted in the preparation of the course. Ultimately we hope to complete some plan of a preparatory course as the result of suggestions which we hope to receive from the teachers in the preparatory schools.

I should like, by way of further explanation, to refer to one or two things which Mr. Ramsay has said. First, he said that he hoped there might be a sliding scale, so as to give a maximum and a minimum requirement. It is not intended that the requirements in Latin and Greek should be obligatory upon the colleges as a whole, but if, for instance, one college wishes to call for only the elementary part of the proposed requirements it will be at perfect liberty to do so. Second, he said in reference to the examination upon a prescribed part of Cicero's speeches that he wished that the examination might have been upon his letters or some part of his essays, or at least that these might have been associated with the speeches in the examination. The committee had that in mind, and thought that in Latin and Greek as well there would be done in successive years exactly what is now done in the English requirements, namely, that certain subjects would be prescribed for the examination for a series of years, and changed from time to time in order to give variety to the school courses and opportunities for the teachers to change their methods and their work from year to year. The third point, I think, which he made was in reference to the advanced requirements—what was meant by stating that the two examinations could be taken separately, in contradistinction to the statement of the elementary requirements, that they cannot be taken separately? The meaning of the committee was that (*a*) and (*b*) of the elementary examinations, practically one paper, must be taken at one session, while (1) and (2) of the advanced requirements may

be on papers taken at different sessions. They did not mean that (1) and (2) would be taken as (*a*) and (*b*) on the same paper at the same time, though they might be so taken if the examiner desired. Mr. Ramsay's other remarks, as I recollect them, had so much to do with the proposed preparatory course rather than the proposed requirements, that I do not think it necessary for me to speak of them in particular. I wish only to say a few words in reference to the thought which was in the committee's mind in the preparation of these requirements.

There is no such thing as an exact division in knowledge in Latin and Greek between the colleges and the preparatory schools. The colleges complete what the schools begin. Their work is one. Of course the schools must begin with grammatical instruction, but they must proceed to arouse an interest in the authors read, as authors, and for the thought which they contain. Such an interest must begin in the schools, and if at the end of the college course something more than a grammatical knowledge has been developed it will be because a literary interest was begun in the schools.

The committee had in mind—How shall that interest be obtained? And it seemed to them that it can be obtained only by beginning in the preparatory school that work which must be continued in the college, namely, the reading of authors, and by recognizing the fact that reading cannot be carried on without a basis of grammar. There must be an understanding of the forms in order to enable the scholar to read. The committee, therefore, put in the elementary part the critical study of grammar, which they thought essential, so that the scholar should be, from the very beginning of his course, as it were, limber in his mental fingers, and be able to grasp easily the forms of conjugation, declension, and the rules of syntax. They believed, if the grammatical work were thoroughly done by the time of the elementary examinations, that the knowledge of forms and constructions would be retained during the last year, in the advanced subjects, and that when the student entered college he would be able to go on easily, readily, and rapidly in the work which the college ought to do.

I may say, as the result of my teaching in college, that there are certain things in which I find the boys especially deficient, and they are the things in which it seems to me that the proposed requirements will be beneficial. I find that they are deficient in a usable knowledge of the forms of grammar. Perhaps every one of them will be able to decline nouns and con-

jugate verbs, as a matter of declension or conjugation, but when he sees a word in a sentence he does not recognize the relation indicated by the termination. He may, for instance, tell that the third person singular, present indicative active of *amare* is *amat*, but when he sees it with other words he does not at once grasp its relation. In other words he has not a usable knowledge of forms. The second difficulty which I find is, that boys have no vocabulary. They do not know the meaning of common words. They have learned them from the dictionary, it may be, but not in association with one another. Third, they have not learned to read Latin aloud, that is, they have not learned to pronounce it. The pronunciation of Latin which the boys bring to college is generally very imperfect. When I ask a student to stand and read a passage, he halts and stumbles, and often has to wait a considerable time before he is able to get the correct pronunciation of the words. Now, it seems to me that the ear has almost as much to do as the eye in learning a foreign language, and a dead language at that ; and that in the study of Latin and Greek, especially in the preliminary courses, a student ought to be helped by the cultivation of his ear in distinguishing sounds and words. It seemed to the committee that in the preparation of these requirements provision was made for this very thing, and that the stress laid upon sight reading and reading aloud was justified. This practice regularly pursued in the schools would not only lead to the acquisition of the language, but would aid in the development of the mind of the scholar.

This subject of the best method of preparatory work is a great one, and, as I said, I hope to get suggestions from others. The committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, has still a great deal of work to do in the preparation of these preparatory courses in Latin and Greek, and we wish suggestions from the teachers as to the things of which the preparatory course should consist. The statement of Mr. Ramsay was so full as to the desirability of these requirements that they seem to me to need no further explanations and no further defence. I think they carry their own defence. The only objection which we met in preparing them was from the colleges, and that objection was that they did not provide for enough grammar. I did not agree with some of the Commission in that objection. I believe that they do provide enough grammar, and that if the scheme is carried out and the grammar begins at the beginning and is thoroughly mastered, the scholar will

have, all the way through, a better course than he otherwise would have, and will secure a more effective means of reading and enjoyment in the later school courses and in the college course as well.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : Professor Frank E. Woodruff, of Bowdoin College, will be the next speaker.

PROFESSOR WOODRUFF : *Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen*—I came here with a desire to hear what the teachers of the secondary schools have to say rather than to express my own ideas on this subject. In response to your invitation, however, I will say a few words in explanation of the requirements in Latin and Greek that have been adopted by the College Commission. In the first place I wish to emphasize what Professor Lord has already said, namely, that the requirements proposed by the Commission are a method of examination rather than prescribed courses of study in Latin and Greek. The courses which are found upon the same sheet are simply specimen courses, to show the feasibility of the proposed system of examinations. There was no thought of prescribing fixed courses, to be pursued in a definite order, with specified portions of each author. That was as far as possible from our idea.

The reasons for adopting this new system of examinations may be stated under two heads. In the first place a burden which now rests heavily upon some of the preparatory schools will be removed, and that too, without putting any new burden in the place of the old, for there is no increase of time asked for ; the time already given to the classics is all that can reasonably be demanded. If this system of requirements is adopted, the difficulty which confronts so many schools will be done away. It will no longer be necessary to put candidates for admission to Harvard into one class, and candidates for Yale into another, and thus multiply the work and increase the number of classes indefinitely. The boys fitting for the different colleges can keep together. In order to accomplish this, Mr. Ramsay has just spoken of a sliding scale of requirements as desirable. Such a sliding scale is, in my opinion, just what is furnished in the proposed plan.

Besides the advantage of uniformity of requirements on the part of the colleges, the secondary schools will gain large freedom in the method to be pursued and in the choice of authors

to be read. The requirements call for a certain degree of proficiency. The mode in which that proficiency is to be acquired is left in large degree to the instructor. He will not be obliged to take his pupils through the same portions of the same authors year after year, but can relieve the monotony of his work by breaking new ground, and the increased interest of the teacher in what he is doing will bear fruit in the increased interest of the pupil.

On the part of the colleges there is a desire to secure, along with the advantage of uniformity in requirements for admission, improvement in the quality of the work. I think it is admitted by all, certainly by those who have tried the experiment for themselves, that to put exclusive emphasis upon reading at sight, to make that the sole test of the pupil's knowledge of Latin and Greek, is a mistake. It is a onesided mode of instruction which almost inevitably results in superficiality, and thus defeats itself; it fails to give that accurate grammatical knowledge which is indispensable if a high standard of college work in the classics is to be maintained. On the other hand if reading at sight is neglected, and the work is restricted to the preparation of specified passages, failure is equally sure and equally lamentable; for while the pupil may gain thorough grammatical knowledge—which is by no means a certainty as the colleges discover anew at every examination—this method is sure to fail in the most vital point; it fails to kindle interest and develop power. But the union of these two essentials in the same programme of study makes, it seems to me, the ideal course; and I think that in the requirements we are discussing the amount of prescribed work is sufficient to insure thorough grammatical drill, while the stress placed upon reading at sight will determine in a general way the method to be followed in the preparatory schools; the emphasis will be put where it ought to be, upon the aiding of the pupil to gain command over his resources, upon the development of power.

To recapitulate then. The essential principle of the requirements is elasticity. They demand a certain degree of proficiency when the candidate comes up for examination, while they leave to the teacher large freedom in the selection and methods of his work. The end is clearly stated, the means are left to the teacher's own choosing. I think the change ought to be welcomed because it promises a uniform scheme of requirements by the colleges; because it gives this larger freedom to the preparatory teachers so that new life can be

put into their work ; and because, as a result of this stimulus to the teacher, it promises substantial gain in the quality of the work, which means for the pupil increased profit from his studies in the secondary school, and preparation for more efficient work in college.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : Ladies and Gentlemen, the subject is now open for general discussion.

PROFESSOR A. G. HARKNESS, of Brown University : *Mr. President*—I regret that my absence from the country prevented me from attending the conference held in Boston on the ninth of May. I should have preferred to express my views in reference to the requirements at that time rather than at the present. I need not say that I am in most hearty sympathy with the efforts of the Commission, and that I appreciate the difficulty of framing a proposition which will meet with the approval of all. I desire, however, to say a word in regard to that part of the recommendation which relates to a specifically prescribed number of pages.

For myself I should be perfectly satisfied if the students who enter Brown could pass a satisfactory examination on what is called the advanced requirements. If a student can translate Latin prose and poetry ; and you notice that the statement does not limit the selection to easy passages ; and can explain forms, constructions, idioms, and prosody, and can also translate connected English narrative into real Latin, I should not care to give him a thorough examination on a few prescribed pages of Cicero. My experience has been that only the brilliant men of a class, only a comparatively small number, are capable of thus reading and writing Latin. To add a prescribed portion seems to me to be not an increase of the requirements but rather a concession to those who, though not so brilliant, are yet earnest and hard-working students. This part of the requirements I consider just and reasonable and even necessary if we are to form a just estimate of the attainments of a student and of his ability to do the college work with success ; but I cannot persuade myself that the amount specified is sufficient. If it were the intention of the committee that students should know certain fine passages of classic authors almost by heart, so that they might have these as models ever before their minds, possibly thirty pages would be too large

an amount to require. This however is evidently not the purpose of the committee as the prescribed portion is placed in the elementary requirements, and the examination on this part, though it is to be thorough, is to be limited to the ordinary forms, constructions, and idioms, and it is even implied that the translation into Latin which is based on this part is to be easier than that based on other passages outside of these prescribed pages. Granting that it is the idea of the committee that the students shall have such a thorough knowledge of the prescribed pages that they shall make the vocabulary, the constructions and idioms so much their own that they can use them in writing Latin, I should still be sorry to see the amount limited to thirty pages, and these thirty pages limited to Cicero's orations. Thirty pages is not a tenth part of what we require for admission to Brown. If any part of the preparatory work is to be specified for a special examination it seems to me that a tenth of the whole is a very meagre amount. I think that as a rule not over half as much Greek is read in preparation for college as Latin, for Brown not half the number of pages is required, and yet in the case of the Greek thirty pages, or one-fifth of the whole amount read, is not considered too much. If this part of the requirements in Latin is to have real meaning, and is to be regarded as of importance even in comparison with the sight-work, I feel that the specified amount should not be placed at less than fifty pages.

It doubtless appeared to the committee necessary to limit this required part to one author, as so small an amount could not with advantage be divided; but this limitation does not seem to me to be a wise one. I am aware that Cicero has always been regarded as the best model for writing Latin, but thirty pages of his orations have not been so regarded. He is an admirable model, when not simply his orations are taken into consideration, but also his philosophical and rhetorical writings and his letters as well, where his style appears to the best advantage because it is here more simple and natural. The orations which are usually read in preparatory schools are not well adapted to serve the beginner as his only model, especially when it is stated that the passage for translation into Latin will be connected narrative. In the Catiline orations the orator does not appear to the best advantage, and though the oration for the Poet Archias is so perfect of its kind, it is in

too elaborate and elevated a style to serve the schoolboy as a model.

I know that there is in some quarters a reaction against Caesar, owing in part doubtless to the extravagant praise bestowed upon him by such writers as Mommsen and Froude ; I know too, that some teachers find Caesar's writings dull and prosaic ; and yet his simple, vigorous, and concise style is an admirable supplement to the ornate and diffuse oratorical style of Cicero. The style of Caesar, too, is a better representative of the distinguishing characteristics of the Latin language. What student whose critical study of Latin had been limited to Cicero's orations would imagine that Latin was the most concise of all languages, and that this was a most prominent feature of its literature from Cato to Tacitus, or even from the laws of the Twelve Tables to the Christian Fathers, with only here and there an exception.

The styles of Caesar and Cicero supplement each other so well that I should be sorry to see either specified to the exclusion of the other. It may be said that this is provided for by the announcement that the connected narrative will be based on some portion of the Latin prose usually read. This is at best vague and if certain pages are specified on which the student is to be especially examined he will necessarily make this the basis of his translation into Latin. I should accordingly like to see a given amount of both of these authors specified, and twenty-five pages of each would seem to me as small an amount as it would be wise to give.

These recommendations have already been presented to the colleges, but as yet none have taken definite action. They cannot take intelligent action until the subject lies before them as a whole, until the committee has decided how large an amount of the authors named pupils may be expected to read. The answer to this question will show whether the requirements for college are by these recommendations increased or decreased. Ability to read at sight has not an invariable meaning. It means one thing in the case of pupils who have read one hundred pages, another in the case of those who have read five hundred.

I would desire that the committee while considering this subject, which is still before them, would also consider the wisdom of dividing the required amount between Caesar and Cicero and of making a comparatively small addition to the required amount, but such as would make the division feasible.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : An expression of opinion has been desired from the preparatory schools.

DR. C. F. P. BANCROFT, of Phillips Academy: *Mr. President*—I suppose the main question has passed out of the region of discussion, of argument and criticism, and that we are occupying ourselves now chiefly with the details. I am sure the preparatory schools will welcome any agreement on the part of the colleges in this matter, even though it puts a hardship upon the schools in certain directions. As has been said over and over again, we long for relief from diversity of requirements in the various colleges. This subject looks towards a better day; for that reason I am sure the preparatory schools as a whole will welcome it.

We must bear in mind that there is a question of the articulation of the schools and colleges, and also another question of the closer articulation between the schools themselves. That, perhaps, is threatened somewhat by the large range which is permitted under this new scheme. The diversity which has prevailed in the colleges may transfer itself to the schools. It may be much more difficult for schools to coöperate with each other, and for pupils to transfer themselves from one school to another. The consensus of the schools as to books, methods, order of subjects, and rate of progress will be more or less disturbed, at least for a time.

There is one other point, it seems to me, which also ought to be mentioned, and that is that the reading, in Latin particularly, is mostly in the last part of the course. It seems to me that the requirements in the earlier years, as suggested by the programmes, are too meagre. I do not know what may be the case in the high schools, but I am sure, in the schools which I am most familiar with, the many subjects taught press their claim for time in the latter part of the four years. For instance, the teacher of Physics says, "I do not want to teach my subject till the boys are well grounded in Geometry." The teacher of Arithmetic and Algebra is called upon to support the Geometry teacher. The teacher of History says it is perfectly hopeless to try to teach Greek History or Roman History in the first or second year. We are in great danger, therefore, of overloading the last years in our courses, especially if new subjects are introduced, as is proposed. Therefore we ought to aim to accomplish far more in the Latin, especially in the first two years. The requirements in

Greek, in the first of the three years, are larger, relatively, than those on the Latin side. I am aware that thoroughness is far more required than quantity. The student should go slowly at first, and substantially. But experiment has shown that capable students can do large amounts of Latin in the first two years. Our success in teaching Latin is success also in teaching Greek, French, and German. We have no better instrument. Latin goes far to prepare the way for success in all other languages, living and dead, in English as well as French and German. If we make the first year in Latin very rich, very strong, very fruitful, we solve the problem, not only of secondary education, but of upper education for our pupils. This study, difficult but attractive, historical, many-sided, with affinities for other languages, and for the sciences of various sorts, including the natural sciences, is the test of our work at the present time, and I believe it is likely to be for some time to come. Our success in teaching Latin is success in every important subject in the whole curriculum of modern schools.

I wish also to say a word about the text and composition work, and the connection between them. It is lamentable that any one college has allowed separate examinations in Latin and Greek composition, thereby setting them up as distinct and independent requirements. I believe every professional teacher of Latin and Greek desires that emphasis should be laid upon composition in the upper requirements in Latin and Greek, not as a running mate, certainly not as supplementary, but as a substantial, intimate part of the course in these subjects. To say that the boy should be taught to read Vergil and Cicero, and yet permitted to lay aside Latin Composition, is very unfortunate, both for the boy and for the school. I should regret very much if boys, in any great number, should present themselves to college for examination in advanced Latin and Greek without offering, at the same time, Latin and Greek composition. Giving the composition separate examination and separate count is divisive. There is no other way in which we can secure thorough mastery of forms, a thorough mastery of syntax, of vocabulary, sentence-rhythm, style, unless we insist upon composition. There is nothing that stimulates boys to do good work in Latin and Greek so much as an abundance of marked papers in composition. If we ever teach our boys Latin and Greek without this substantial, integral component, there will be a great lapse in these languages,

and we shall lose ground, if we are not extremely careful. This is the only way to learn to appreciate the highest forms of classical literature, and to unfold their strength. Professor Coy and others, who have had much experience in teaching Latin and Greek composition, will endorse every word.

There are some other points which are important to secondary schools, especially to preparatory schools, but I will say only this, that there is a very wide range in our institutions of secondary instruction and the preparatory schools, and they are not so near to each other as we should expect them to be, nor as near as we have sometimes thought that they are. We have a problem there which it would be of advantage to discuss, but it lies outside the present question.

PROFESSOR LORD: I fear that I did not make myself clear on the subject of this examination. The two parts of the elementary examination will be taken at one time and from one paper; the two parts of the advanced examination will be, or may be, taken from two papers, and will come on the same day or on different days at the judgment of the examiner. The two parts of the elementary examination are united and considered as a whole because it was not thought desirable that a student should pass in one and fail in the other, but in the advanced examination, in which grammar has so little appearance, it was thought desirable to bring the composition into a more important place.

PRESIDENT SEELYE: Dr. Keep is in the audience. We should like to have a word from him.

DR. KEEP: I think we are under very great obligations to the Committee who made this careful scheme, and I think their wisdom and temperance is very apparent in the scheme. I suppose a kind of impromptu suggestion, and inquiries that come from persons such as I am, about the work proposed, is what the Committee desire. These inquiries may not be very important in themselves, but may still be of some interest to the Committee in endeavoring to determine the specific amounts and quantities necessary. First, in regard to the remark that Dr. Bancroft made I think we must recognize the difference in the mental development of the average pupil, on entering the high school, and the mental development of the average pupil on entering our larger endowed academies. There is

probably a certain amount of mental immaturity, lack of self reliance, that characterizes the average boy in the city high school, which ought not to characterize the boy who goes to schools like Phillips Academy. More rapid progress is not only feasible, but necessary, in a school like Andover and Exeter than in a city high school. Another query occurring to me is—as I look over the programme of the work laid down for the second year—can two books of Caesar be accomplished in a single term? I am not prepared to say that it cannot be done, yet the query occurred to me. The next interesting query would be in the matter of transition from Caesar to Ovid, and how intelligently and how readily and well the young people would do, at this stage, the 800 or 1,000 lines in the *Metamorphoses*. In regard to the proper order of Vergil and Cicero in the preparatory schools, my opinion has been that it is better for Cicero to precede. But I have lately been less sure about this point.

MR. M. GRANT DANIELL, of the Chauncy-Hall School: I should like to raise one query in regard to the “thirty pages” and the rest of the study of Latin. It seems to me that there is a likelihood that many teachers and pupils may find a stumbling block here. On that thirty pages there is to be a “thorough” study. The indication would seem to be that, for the rest of the Latin the pupils read, the study is to be less thorough,—not thorough. If it is claimed that a thorough study of the thirty pages covers all the rest of the ground, and that pupils will thereafter be thorough whether or not, I should be inclined to doubt the validity of that claim. Pupils sometimes come to recitation, saying that they have a general understanding of the sense of a passage, but that they cannot quite make it all out. That means, I think, that they have a vague understanding, that is to say, not an understanding at all of the passage, certainly not a thorough knowledge of it; but they seem to be satisfied. Is not this requirement, as it stands, likely to cause many teachers and pupils to think that, if they are thorough in thirty pages, they may be satisfied with vagueness and non-thoroughness in the rest? I do not, certainly, think that the Committee intended anything of that sort; but is not that a natural inference from the language of the requirement as it is stated? To be “thorough” in the thirty pages, the pupil has got to be familiar with all the etymological forms and syntactical principles involved therein. He may naturally

think that he is not expected to be quite so "thorough" with the rest of it. I agree with what Dr. Bancroft said in regard to carrying on of the composition for a long time and in large quantities. Perhaps my query is not apt; if so, it can easily be put to silence.

DR. TETLOW: Professor Harkness, in his criticism of the report of the Committee, has raised a very interesting question—the question, I mean, as to the purpose for which we teach Latin composition in the preparatory schools. Speaking perhaps unduly from the point of view of his elective work with college classes, he has emphasized the importance of acquiring a good Latin style, and he thinks the Committee made a mistake in confining the thirty pages of text prescribed for thorough study, to Cicero's speeches. On this point, I am inclined to agree with the Committee, whose object I conceive to have been to make the pupil's work in Latin composition reinforce his power to interpret the literature read. The purpose for which pupils in the preparatory school are required to write Latin, using the text which they are reading both for material and as model, is not so much that they may acquire a good Latin style, as that they may strengthen their power to follow the author's diction and construction and interpret his thought. If I am right, it is eminently proper that, while the pupil is reading Cicero's speeches, the material for his work in Latin composition should be drawn from the same source. With Professor Harkness's opinion that the pupil's reading in Cicero should not be confined to Cicero's speeches, I heartily concur.

DR. WILLIAM GALLAGHER, of Williston Seminary: *Mr. President*—I do not know that I have any experience that would be of any avail to this body. I feel, every time that I go home from any one of these gatherings, that my problem is quite unique, and that I have very little to contribute to the discussions. One little thing that I do wish to speak of is the introduction of Herodotus before Homer. Objection was made to it by one of the speakers this morning. The students in passing directly from the Attic Greek to Homer, are confronted with many difficulties. By introducing a certain amount of Herodotus, we gradually get them acquainted with the problems of the new dialect so that they are less puzzled when they begin Homer. I find that if they can read Herodotus for one term, they can pass into an

acquaintance with the Homeric dialect very readily. I have done that now for nine years, and every year my confidence in the usefulness of Herodotus as a preparation for Homer has increased. Dr. Tetlow has given us a little chapter of his own experience in teaching the girls of his senior class. I introduced with my Herodotus the following plan: We have a written exercise every day. I intend that the first five, six, or seven minutes of every hour, shall be given to a written exercise so thoroughly done that the boys need have no fear of any examination or test. They write every day, so that it becomes second nature to them. There are five questions to be treated. I endeavor to make out from the text of the previous day a Greek sentence that shall be Attic Greek, and that shall tell something about the lesson of that day, and yet shall have so little bearing on the subject that memory will not serve, so that it becomes a practice in sight reading every single day. There also will be questions, two or three of the five, on grammar, or on Attic forms of the dialect they are reading, and one question always in Greek composition. We also use Professor Woodruff's book. We have exercises in it once a week. We cannot have it every day. With my boys I cannot get more than this well done, but the composition in the written exercise day by day is based on that particular portion which was used, say, on the previous Monday. In that way the boys get a pretty thorough acquaintance with the subject of the lesson every day. They have this practice—a little acquaintance with sight Greek, a little drill on grammar, and a little acquaintance with composition every day; but it comes so constantly and so steadily that in the course of a couple of months I find we have passed over a large part of the Greek grammar. I ought to say, that in assigning the Herodotus lesson, instead of expecting the boys to know everything about every single word on the page or page and-a-half, as I was expected to know it in my day, I simply specify particular parts, and have them learn those parts thoroughly, with the result that in six weeks or two months they cover the whole Greek grammar. Whereas, if I try to cover the whole ground every lesson, I am just as badly off at the end of the year as at the beginning. The latter plan is an endeavor to make two half cooked dinners equivalent to one well-cooked dinner. It never worked well in the culinary department, and certainly has never worked well in Herodotus. I am a strong believer in putting Herodotus between Attic Greek and Homer.

Again, I think it is a great mistake to have all examinations

based on sight work. While that is an ideal plan I think there are other ways of developing power. Some of the boys who cannot succeed in doing the sight work do succeed in what is called the prescribed work. They can pass in *Anabasis* and *Homer*. They may not be able to pass in sight Greek, but they can all do good work in college, do substantial work, and make most excellent men; for, of course, that is the thing we aim at. I find fellows who are going to make good scholars, good, substantial men, who have an inability to do anything with sight work.

With regard to the order in which *Vergil* and *Cicero* should be taken up, we have changed our minds more than once at Williston. We now have *Cicero* last, and we find that the boys take part of the story of *Vergil* more readily than the argumentative part of the orations of *Cicero*. They make awful work of seeing what *Cicero* is driving at, but they get a pretty fair comprehension, I think, of *Vergil's* meaning,—perhaps because a certain degree of imaginative power is developed earlier. They seem to get the *Vergil* idea more readily and earlier than they get the *Cicero* idea.

DR. TETLOW: Have you ever tried the plan of beginning with the Third Oration instead of the First? That is almost purely narrative.

DR. GALLAGHER: I have not.

DR. WM. T. PECK, of the Providence High School: *Mr. President*—I had the pleasure of being at the Conference of the Professors of Latin and Greek upon the report of this Committee, so, perhaps, I should not add a word here. The point was brought up at that meeting, in regard to the amount to be read, whether it had not better be stated in a general way what amount of Latin and Greek read would secure the proper preparation for sight examinations. The Committee have not followed out that suggestion, lest perchance the old method should still prevail, and the new should not come into use. Their statement of requirements is, of course, adapted to the giving of examinations by the colleges, but there is a practical question that comes to many of us who send our students to college by certificate. An attempt has been made to secure uniformity in the certificates of the colleges. But the present certificate blanks are based upon the old requirements, and

the preparatory teacher has to certify that the pupil has read so much Caesar, so much Sallust, so much Ovid, and so much Vergil. What kind of certificate blanks will the colleges send to the preparatory schools if the proposed changes in requirements are made? Will they still send the same blanks? If they do, how will the preparatory schools be able to vary their reading and follow out these new requirements?

I have tried, in looking at the requirements, to see if the Committee could not help us to secure now uniform certificate-blanks from the colleges. If their plan should be adopted, a certificate may be made so simple as to state that the requirements have been fulfilled in Latin and Greek. The question comes, whether the colleges will be satisfied with such a certificate. It seems to me, that they cannot longer, in accordance with the spirit of this proposed statement of requirements, demand definite amounts in the studies. The basis upon which the examiners will decide the value of the requirements or the character of their examinations is the number of years that the subject has been studied, as the report states that the elementary examinations, for instance, will be adapted to the proficiency of those who have studied Latin in a systematic course of five lessons a week through at least three school years. Would it not be well for the Committee to suggest to the colleges a change in the basis of their certificate, and that if they are to demand more than the simple statement that the requirements have been fulfilled, they demand the statement that the pupil has pursued a course in Latin three years for the elementary, and four years for the advanced examination, at the rate of five lessons a week. I think it would help us very much where we send to a large number of colleges by certificate, if there should be a way suggested by this Committee, in their final report, to show the basis upon which the certificate should be made.

PRESIDENT SEELYE: The Chair understands that no vote was intended to be taken on this subject, but that it was brought before the Association for discussion, and that opinions were to be elicited to-day which might guide the colleges in their future action in reference to these requirements, and also might assist the Committee in their action in perfecting the plan which has already been proposed. If that be the under-

standing of the Association, we can adjourn without further action in regard to it. If, however, the Association desires to place upon record its approbation or disapprobation of these requirements as a whole, it is at liberty to do so. I wait for any action the Association may take, or if no action is proposed, and the Association prefers to adjourn at the usual hour, I should consider the discussion as closed, as we have already reached the hour which is ordinarily appointed for adjournment—twelve o'clock.

DR. TETLOW : *Mr. President*—I move that the action of the Association taken yesterday in regard to the requirements of History be brought to the attention of the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations.

The motion was adopted.

DR. HULING : There is a matter which was discussed in a recent meeting of the Executive Committee and referred to the Association. As Secretary I was asked to present it at this meeting. It is the question whether the travelling expenses of the Executive Committee, at their meetings during the year, should be paid out of the treasury of the Association? Our membership is now sufficiently large for these expenses to be so met without injury to any of the interests of the Association. For a full meeting of our Executive Committee, it is necessary that some members should come long journeys, one from Maine, another from Western Connecticut, and another from Western Massachusetts. The others of the Executive Committee are comparatively near to the usual meeting place in Boston. In view of the time which must be given by these members to these journeys, it seems advisable to have the custom established of paying the travelling expenses of the members of the Executive Committee, just as the custom has already been established of paying the travelling expenses of delegates who are appointed in the name of the Association to attend any special conference.

DR. GALLAGHER : *Mr. President*—I move you that the Treasurer be authorized to pay the travelling expenses of our Executive Committee whenever it seems necessary for them to meet and transact our business. We very gladly refer mat-

ters to the Executive Committee, and have done so for some years. We have piled an enormous amount of work upon them, and I think, in all justice, we ought to pay their travelling expenses.

DR. BANCROFT : Dr. Huling does a large amount of work for the Association which involves a large occasional expense and occupies a large amount of time. I wish to incorporate in this motion a suggestion that the Executive Committee take into consideration the question whether he ought not to have some recognition for his work on our behalf. I suggest that this be referred to the Executive Committee with power to act.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : Does Dr. Gallagher accept that amendment ?

Dr. Gallagher assented.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : It is moved that the Treasurer be empowered to pay the travelling expenses of the Executive Committee whenever it is necessary for them to meet to consider the matters referred to them by the Association ; and that, also, the Executive Committee have power to award such compensation to the Secretary as in their judgment may seem expedient. Is there anything to be said in reference to this motion ? Those in favor of it will please signify this by holding up their right hands.

The motion was adopted.

PRESIDENT SEELYE : Is there any other business to come before the Association ?

DR. BANCROFT : I move that we adjourn.

The motion was adopted, and the Association adjourned.

Ray Greene Huling,

Secretary

Cambridge, Mass.